DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 165 FL 021 776

AUTHOR	Slick, Sam L., Ed.; Klein, Richard B., Ed.
TITLE	Managing the Foreign Language Department: A Chairperson's Primer.
INSTITUTION	Southern Conference on Language Teaching.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-88364-0-00-8
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	309p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Valdosta State University, Valdosta, GA 31698 ($20 inclusive).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Guides; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; College Presidents; *College Second Language Programs; *Department Heads; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; *Program Administration; *Second Languages

ABSTRACT

A collection of 31 articles addresses issues in college language department administration, focusing on the role and responsibilities of the department head. The following articles are included: "View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts College President Expects from a Language Department" (Schmidt); "View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts Dean Expects from a Language Department" (Allan); "View from the Top: What a Graduate School Dean Expects from a Language Department" (Reedy); "Raison d'etre: Foreign Languages and the Liberal Arts Today" (Sachs); "Administering Graduate Programs" (Schulman); "Recruiting and Hiring Faculty" (Mullen); "Evaluating Faculty" (Eustis); "Motivating Faculty Performance and Encouraging Scholarship" (Parr); "Employing and Managing Part-Time Faculty in Foreign Languages" (Bostick); "Grantsmanship: Establishing a Process" (Verzasconi); "Staff Development for Foreign Language Faculty" (Terry); "Coordinating Foreign Language Graduate Teaching Assistants" (Baldwin); "Long-Range Planning: Crisis Intervention and Putting a Troubled Department Back on Course" (Tatum); "Chairing the Small Department: Or When You're the Only One" (Klein); "Purpose and Function of Professional Associations and Meetings: Networking" (Gay-Crosier); "Legal Issues: Employment Discrimination, Sexual and Racial Harassment" (Zatlin); "Women's Issues: Sexism, Joint Appointments, and Other Troublesome Matters" (Sullivan); "Spaniards vs. Germans vs. French vs. Russians vs. Italians vs. Chinese vs. Japanese, etc.: The Blissfulness of Multiculturalism" (Lamoureux); "Teaching Foreign Languages and Literatures: Confrontation, Coexistence, or Collaboration" (Medley, Jr.); "The Foreign Language Department and Less Commonly Taught Languages" (Vieira); "The Foreign Language Department and Study Abroad Programs" (Zipser); "Academic and Career Advising for Foreign Language Majors and Minors" (Perricone); "The Chair and Collective Bargaining" (Zamora); "Teaching and Research in Institutions Large and Small" (Wellington); "Public Relations: Evolving Into the 'We-Care Attitude of Action'" (Dease); "Elementary and Intermediate Foreign Language Programs: Nervous from the Service" (Gallant); "The Foreign Language Department and Interdisciplinary Studies" (Slick); "Managing the Office: No, Secretaries Are Not God, Although They May Seem Like It" (Thames); "Foreign Language Departments at Two-Year Schools: The Issues before Us" (Fountain); "How Long to Stay on the Job: Counting the Gray Hairs" (Klein); and "Additional Items of Importance: What You Really Need to Know, but Didn't Know Enough to Ask" (Klein and Slick). (MSE)

ED 368 165

Managing the Foreign Language Department: A Chairperson's Primer

Sam L. Slick and Richard B. Klein, Editors

SCOLT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee Bradley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CULTURE

Languages

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

LINGUISTICS

Literature

FL021776

SCOLT

Managing the Foreign Language Department: A Chairperson's Primer

MANAGING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT:

A CHAIRPERSON'S PRIMER

Sam L. Slick
University of Southern Mississippi

and

Richard B. Klein
University of Mississippi

Editors

SCOLT

Southern Conference on Language Teaching
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, Georgia

©1993
Southern Conference on Language Teaching
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, GA 31698

All rights reserved
including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 93-84304
Printed in the United States of America
by Colson Printing Company
Valdosta, GA 31601
ISBN: 1-883640-00-8

Dedication

We dedicate this book to the memory of our fathers:

Harvey L. Slick and A. A. Klein.

CONTENTS

Foreword
Lee Bradley xi

Acknowledgments
Sam L. Slick and Richard B. Klein xiii

Introduction
Sam L. Slick and Richard B. Klein xv

1 **View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts College President Expects from a Language Department**
Ruth A. Schmidt 1

2 **View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts Dean Expects from a Language Department**
George Allan 9

3 **View from the Top: What a Graduate School Dean Expects from a Language Department**
Daniel R. Reedy 19

4 ***Raison d'être*: Foreign Languages and the Liberal Arts Today**
Murray Sachs 27

5 **Administering Graduate Programs**
Ivan A. Schulman 35

6 **Recruiting and Hiring Faculty**
Edward J. Mullen 47

7 **Evaluating Faculty**
J. Christopher Eustis 59

8 **Motivating Faculty Performance and Encouraging Scholarship**
James A. Parr 73

9 **Employing and Managing Part-Time Faculty in Foreign Languages**
Herman F. Bostick 81

e Foreign Language Department

nship: Establishing a Process
rzasconi 87

lopment for Foreign Language Faculty
Terry 97

ing Foreign Language Graduate
Assistants
W. Baldwin 105

ge Planning: Crisis Intervention
g a Troubled Department Back on

Tatum 115

the Small Department: Or When
e Only One
sol Klein 125

nd Function of Professional Associations
ngs: Networking
Gay-Crosier 133

es: Employment Discrimination,
d Racial Harassment
llin 145

Issues: Sexism, Joint Appointments,
Troublesome Matters
A. Sullivan 153

vs. Germans vs. French vs. Russians vs.
. Chinese vs. Japanese, etc.:
ulness of Multiculturalism
. Lamoureux 163

Foreign Languages and Literatures:
tion, Coexistence, or Collaboration
Medley, Jr. 173

20 **The Foreign Language Department and Less Commonly Taught Languages**
Nelson H. Vieira 183

21 **The Foreign Language Department and Study Abroad Programs**
Richard A. Zipser 195

22 **Academic and Career Advising for Foreign Language Majors and Minors**
Catherine R. Perricone 203

23 **The Chair and Collective Bargaining**
Juan C. Zamora 211

24 **Teaching and Research in Institutions Large and Small**
Marie Adele Wellington 217

25 **Public Relations: Evolving Into the "We-Care Attitude of Action"**
Barbara Crockett Dease 225

26 **Elementary and Intermediate Foreign Language Programs: Nervous from the Service**
Clifford J. Gallant 237

27 **The Foreign Language Department and Interdisciplinary Studies**
Sam L. Slick 245

28 **Managing the Office: No, Secretaries Are *Not* God, Although They May Seem Like It**
Richard W. Thames 253

29 **Foreign Language Departments at Two-Year Schools: The Issues before Us**
Anne O. Fountain 259

30 **How Long to Stay on the Job: Counting the Gray Hairs**
Richard B. Klein 265

31 **Additional Items of Importance: What You Really Need to Know, but Didn't Know Enough to Ask**
Richard B. Klein and Sam L. Slick 273

List of Contributors 307

Foreword

The Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT) is pleased to have been asked by editors Sam L. Slick and Richard B. Klein to publish this collection of essays on managing foreign language departments in American colleges and universities. They have assembled an outstanding group of contributors who have vast experience and valuable information to share with their colleagues in the profession. The essays presented here are of prime importance and interest to **all** department chairs—incumbent, current, and future—as well as to every instructor of second languages.

In *Managing the Foreign Language Department: A Chairperson's Primer*, the ideas expressed by the contributing authors are their own, based on their experience of chairing a foreign language department or working in administration. The authors have been asked to share their own experiences, ideas, and suggestions, and not to summarize previously published information. This volume contains experiential and empirical, not theoretical, direction.

The Board of Directors of SCOLT and the Sponsors and Patrons on the SCOLT Advisory Board are certain that this publication will make a major contribution to the leadership and work of colleagues in foreign languages.

Lee Bradley
Executive Director, SCOLT
Valdosta State University

Acknowledgments

We want to express our appreciation to everyone who made this book possible, including the stalwart professionals who contributed chapters. Additionally, we thank our two superb secretaries, Amy Hull and Lauree Mills-Mooney, for their perseverance and great skill in formatting, word processing, and proofing the manuscript. We also express appreciation and thanks to the members of the Board of Directors of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching, and in particular to Lee Bradley, Frank W. Medley, Jr., and Robert M. Terry for their guidance, support, and encouragement. A final acknowledgment is due Professor T. J. Ray for his help in developing uniform documentation.

Sam L. Slick
Hattiesburg, MS 1993

Richard B. Klein
Oxford, MS 1993

Introduction

The central thesis and goal of this book are simple:

> The role of chairperson or chair—we use the terms synonymously—of a foreign language department has become increasingly complex and demanding during the past three decades. Nevertheless, there exists no text or reference manual that seeks to examine the issues and problems involved in chairing such an academic unit. To fill that void, the editors have invited some thirty former and current chairpersons, as well as several administrators who have not been language chairs, to submit thoughtful and informed essays on a wide variety of topics germane and often unique to administering a foreign language department.

The contributions to this work represent an accumulated total in excess of 200 years of administrative experience. In deciding upon a list of contributors, we considered several factors, including representatives of institutions of different sizes, chairpersons with different language backgrounds, and a general sense of varying geography with regard to the contributor's locale. In short, we feel that the chairpersons whose ideas are contained herein are representative of American higher education.

As is the case in most academic disciplines, chairpersons of foreign language departments are generally recruited from faculty ranks. They come to the job with little or no administrative experience. Often they have no defined management style, know little or nothing about legal issues, have seldom evaluated or supervised others, have never dealt with conflict resolution, and have not been involved with goal setting, long range planning, and the development of plans of action. Additionally, they often come to their new job with inaccurate views as to what constitutes the chairing of a department. And no amount of previously published scholarly articles and books can possibly compensate for these deficiencies.

To make matters worse, many individuals become chairperson by default—that is, they are the only ones willing to serve, or as sometimes happens, the only member of the faculty to whom the rest do not seriously object. The other extreme is equally observable—the chairperson is selected/hired through a highly competitive system that places emphasis on scholarship and reputation as a teacher—two qualities that, while not entirely superfluous to chairing, are of at least dubious import. The result, of course, is that many chairpersons become such through accidental circumstances or for questionable reasons. Once installed in their new position, these individuals must "learn by doing."

New chairpersons, understandably, often seek advice from other administrators. Eventually they may enroll in a variety of generic staff development seminars on everything from faculty evaluation to management strategies to programs on curriculum reform. But most of these programs speak only obliquely to the needs of foreign language departments. Perhaps the most notable exceptions are the ADFL Summer Seminars for chairpersons developed by the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages.

Texts and manuals for new chairpersons are not particularly plentiful either. Among those worth mentioning are Brann and Emmet's *The Academic Department or Division Chairman* (Balamp Press, 1972), John Bennett's *Managing the Academic Department* (Macmillan, 1983), and the most recent edition of Allen Tucker's *Chairing the Academic Department* (Macmillan, 1984). But these works, although valuable for all chairpersons, simply do not address a myriad of issues and dimensions that are unique to the governance of foreign language departments. Thus, to return to our thesis, we offer this volume to the many foreign language professors who have assumed or will assume the position of chairperson.

HIGHER EDUCATION 1960-1993: POLITICAL ELEMENTS OF CHANGE

Prior to the 1960s, America's universities and colleges were stable, conservative institutions catering primarily to a white upper middle class and upper class clientele. Chairing the department in the Golden Era was a relatively simple job assignment. Most difficult decisions fell squarely on the desk of the dean. But with the advent of the 1960s and the baby boomers, institutions and their departments began to change rapidly. As school enrollments increased, so did the size of departments. The chairperson's responsibilities not only grew but also began to change. External events, most notably the Vietnam War and the Civil Rights Movement, brought inevitable change on campus and in the classrooms. The student body, now including an ever-increasing mix of black, Latino, and other minority students, made new demands, often at the department level. Chicano and Puerto Rican Studies programs, at times, sprang up within existing foreign language units. Majors were apt to be politically active and committed to one or more causes that subsumed interest in their discipline. In the off hours students had to deal with, if not participate in, the counterculture, drugs, and the sexual revolution.

As these changes fueled the 1960s and propelled headlong into the 1970s, new issues began to emerge: gay rights, environmental concerns, anti-nuclear movements. Enter affirmative action. Most importantly, the great curriculum wars of the 1970s began. These struggles resulted in widespread adoption of cafeteria course offerings and deconstruction of core curricula. Foreign languages promptly entered a bleak decade of precipitous decline.

The 1980s, although perhaps more stable than the 60s and 70s, continued the scenario of higher education's response, sometimes in an exaggerated manner, to the ravages of social and political flux. In spite of a self-centered "meism," reflected primarily by the yuppies of the mid-1980s, change continues to dominate higher education. More recently, issues such as minority access, global education, multiculturalism, cultural diversity, recruitment and retention, gender issues, women's studies, collective bargaining, and political correctness have come to the forefront. Protected classes abound, resulting in endless EOC claims against universities (and departments and individuals). Sexual and racial harassment are now well-defined and invite litigation on a moment's notice. "Political correctness," an especially explosive issue in foreign language departments because of their often enriched multinational nature, now shapes many faculty and chairpersons' comments and memos. Core curricula and the nature of the major occupy center stage at many institutional debates. Faculty governance now enjoys a complete reexamination. All of these issues produce problems, and it is often the chairperson who must confront them first.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE 1960-1993: FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Foreign language, as an academic discipline and teaching field, has undergone an absolutely dizzying evolution (including dramatic ups and downs) during the past thirty years. Sputnik and the ensuing NDEA monies for foreign language together represent a benchmark. From that point in time (circa 1958) until the present, our field of study has been changing at breakneck speed—and with this change have come pressures on chairpersons that were unimagined by chairs of the 1950s and before.

The 1960s, then, exploded with concerns and new developments: language laboratories, curriculum restructuring, ALM, the Peace Corps, and FLES. The 1970s witnessed the beginning of a torrent of new methodologies that continues unabated: Rassias, TPR, Suggestopedia, Silent Way, the Natural Approach. With new accountability came the proficiency movement of the 1980s. Much change occurred in the classroom with the mass-marketing of video and VCRs, beginning in 1975. Many institutions are now utilizing a wide spectrum of technological innovations in language instruction, insisting on considerable CAI, video disc, and auxiliary satellite instruction. Departments anxiously scramble for authentic materials. Additionally, the ACTFL proficiency guidelines provide direction for many curricular and articulation changes and reforms.

While the how and why of teaching a second language have undergone significant change, so have the curricula offered by colleges and universities. By the mid 1970s bilingual education had arrived. It has measured impact on many foreign language programs, especially Spanish. With an emphasis on global education has come a large variety of interdisciplinary programs and paradigms: international business, international studies, Spanish for communication majors, police, nurses, and whomever. Area studies have assumed a high profile at many schools. In the meantime, the 1980s witnessed a wide-scale reinstitution of the foreign language requirement which, in turn, created a new job market, new demands upon graduate programs, and, quite obviously, a new role for languages in the core curricula. Study abroad programs and immersion programs continue to evolve, often coupled with other disciplines. All of these events, and many more, have brought new connections, demands, and challenges for foreign language departments.

INEVITABLE CONCLUSIONS

The radical incidence and variety of change confronting foreign language departments during the last thirty years, and especially during the last fifteen years, have brought with them many new demands upon chairpersons. These changes, both from historical-social forces and from within the discipline, have greatly increased the scope of responsibility and demands placed upon chairpersons. While deans and vice presidents for academic affairs have resolutely increased underling positions in the form of assistant and associate deans and assistant and associate vice presidents, most chairpersons continue to do it all. They have been forced to become a sort of Super-Professor who not only continues to teach and do research, but who simultaneously balances budgets and schedules, does staff development, serves as instructional leader, curriculum innovator, counselor, handholder for the seemingly unloved, and much more.

To those many, then, who are serving or who will serve in this super capacity, we commend the sage advice contained herein. May it help you in some small way not to have to invent at least one more wheel. May it at a minimum help clarify your administrative views on some of the basic and most palpable issues in our profession.

Sam L. Slick	Richard B. Klein
Hattiesburg, MS 1993	Oxford, MS 1993

CHAPTER 1

View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts College President Expects from a Language Department

---

Ruth A. Schmidt
Agnes Scott College

"Everyone writing for this book either *is* or *has been* a department chair," said the letter inviting me to write a chapter, but somehow I slipped through although I do not fit that description. I never had the opportunity to be department chair because the men in my department 20 years ago would never have considered a woman for the position, neither me nor my experienced female colleagues who had already been chairs elsewhere or who went to new locations where they chaired departments.

So I became a dean without ever chairing a foreign language department and had to learn a lot quickly, including such basics as using a dictating machine and running an office. Because I believe a department chair, particularly where the department has more than three or four people, has one of the hardest jobs in a college or university, I have sometimes felt glad that I skipped that part. But then, the academic dean's work is, in my view, the most difficult of all academic jobs. Although I have now spent 20 years in administrative positions, as dean, provost, and president, many of the views expressed in this chapter are the same as or very little changed from the perspectives I had as a faculty member. I still insist that professors and administrators have much in common as educators. But I've been asked to write from the point of view of a president.

What does a president expect of a language department? Or at least, what does this president expect? First of all, the president expects each department to function as a department, not just as a collection of individual professors, each with a different agenda. This expectation applies, of course, to all departments. There is sometimes a tendency for individual professors to use the institution as a platform for their own agendas which may or may not be good for students, colleagues, or the institution as a whole. The ideal department, perhaps seldom realized, consists of persons who, while they have different interests and strengths, work cooperatively to provide the students in their care with a focused, cohesive program of study. Many of today's curricula, generally less so in foreign language departments because of the need to build skills, look like compendia of individual scholarly interests rather than programs of study carefully crafted to help a student develop in the field chosen. Some structure and attention to the interests of the whole rather than to pet subjects is clearly desirable from any administrator's, and I would hope any colleague's, point of view.

Happy the incoming inexperienced colleague who joins a department which lives true collegiality. Often a young professor's energy is deflected from study and teaching by the intricacies of departmental politics and the perceived need to understand them in order to survive. The greatest sadness of academic life is not the budget, the teaching load, or those administrators professors refer to as "they," but the rivalries, tensions, and pettiness of some in the profession, and therefore, these less desirable aspects of one's colleagues may constitute the biggest challenge for the chair of a department.

Whatever the political situation a department chair may inherit, it should be that person's responsibility to see that new colleagues, especially the inexperienced ones, are given enough orientation to the department and to the college to make them effective colleagues in every way and as soon as possible. Formal and informal mentoring can mean the difference between success and failure, professional well-being and disaster. The chair does not have to be the exclusive mentor, but should see that sufficient orientation and colleagueship is provided.

Secondly, it should be rather obvious that the president expects from each department quality work in instruction and scholarship. A department should teach its fair share of students, given its resources, and its members should give constant attention to the improvement of teaching by experimentation, by consultation with each other, and by familiarity with current methodology and research. Everyone values those persons who believe that there is always a better way to do something and who are willing to put in the time and effort necessary for improvement. They do not feel threatened by others' evaluations or ideas, but always seek a better way through cooperation with others.

The profession of foreign language teaching has gone through many stages during my professional career. Not all approaches, theories, and methods have been equally efficacious, but it certainly behooves all to be aware of the different possibilities for pedagogical improvements, to experiment and share the results with colleagues. The possibilities in instructional technology with the use of media and computers are still largely untapped. Perhaps even that colleague of mine years ago, who complained in a very thick French accent in English that her students could not pronounce French correctly, would find some help with new tools.

The frequent tensions between instructors of language and those who devote themselves strictly to foreign literatures are often reduced in small departments because every professor participates in both language and literature instruction. This certainly does not mean that all professors must teach both (language specialists have traditionally been in much shorter supply than professors of literature), but at a minimum, a mutual appreciation and respect for the importance of instruction in language and literature should be required of all.

What does the president expect of a department in regard to research? I prefer the word scholarship, for in it I include keeping up with others' discoveries and experiments as well as advancing knowledge in one's field. Professional growth is the essential ingredient necessary for a life-time career as a professor. In the liberal arts college, this growth will be demonstrated in a variety of ways, but the professor must not get stuck in a rut.

The longer I am an administrator, the more I realize that being professionally involved (reading scholarly papers, publishing, or being called on as a consultant) is essential because self-esteem is tied to the approval of peers in the profession. It is not enough to impress students with old knowledge. Only those who feel good about themselves professionally have the emotional and psychological health to be good teachers in the long run. I believe that scholarship and teaching are not only compatible, but essential for *every* member of the department. The balance between the various responsibilities of being a professor will vary for individuals, and teaching assignments may reflect these differences.

Thirdly, a president firmly desires that the membranes separating department from department be permeable. In some cases there will be a separate department for each language and literature; in others the languages will be combined in several departments, and in some institutions all foreign languages will be contained in one department. Whatever the arrangement, the president looks for cooperation among the units or departments, and hopes they will not be fighting each other or jockeying for position. The inclusion of less commonly taught languages, perhaps non-European languages, can produce evidences of selfish territoriality, revealing that some foreign languages are used to privileged status in an institution. All foreign language professors should be building on what they have in common, promoting the teaching of languages and cultures throughout the institution and beyond the college's walls. They need each other, and the college needs their collective strength.

In addition to cooperation among foreign language departments, however constituted, professors need to be related to departments beyond foreign languages and literatures as well. Most students will not experience life in the sharply segmented pieces outlined in the college catalog. Therefore, it is truly a blessing when professors and departments give attention to courses which cross the traditional disciplinary and departmental lines. Institutional rules and calculations sometimes discourage departments from cooperating as fully as they might, but where professors truly believe in interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary teaching, it will be possible to find joint opportunities with history departments, art departments, and even with English departments (which sometimes believe they own the entire literature curriculum).

There are many ways to work out such cooperation, whether it be by exchange of guest lectures, by true team teaching, by linking courses in history, political science, and economics with cultural courses or literature in the foreign language departments, or by the provision of sections or some sessions of courses which use a foreign language across the curriculum. Although it may not be possible to find all these interesting combinations in small faculties, there will always be some opportunity for cross-disciplinary cooperation. Even a few good examples for students will help them see the holistic nature of knowledge and experience the electric effect when scholars from different fields talk with each other as well as with students in the same classroom.

Fourthly, presidents who are forced, by the very nature of their responsibilities, to take an *institutional* perspective dearly desire that each professor and each department share some of this perspective. This goes beyond the idea of cooperation outlined above. While we recognize that the majority of a professor's time will be devoted to his or her area of expertise and to the teaching of that field, in order for the institution to fulfill its mission of educating liberally, there must be attention to what each person and the department contribute to the whole. Remembering this synergy in curriculum committees and on the floor of faculty meetings is essential if there is to be a true community of scholars.

Foreign language departments today have a special opportunity to contribute to the college as a whole. There is ever-increasing recognition that the peoples and countries of this world are interdependent, and language departments should be key players in helping to broaden the global perspective of colleagues and students. The foreign language professor can be a guide to help others understand another culture and to recognize that there are many ways not only to prepare food, or go about daily life, but also in perceiving one's relationship to the world and what life should offer.

Personally, I am very grateful that a lifelong study of Spanish language and culture has enriched my life; it is hard for me to imagine being a monocultural person. However, acquaintance in depth with more than one culture is still not the experience of the majority of our U.S. students. In today's world, foreign language departments have an unusually fine opportunity to help the entire institution. Colleagues who do not have this lifelong devotion to more than one culture can still experience the richness of even partial understanding of another people. Our very survival as human beings may depend on such knowledge. Thankfully, we find colleagues in political science, history, and other disciplines who are helping all to recognize the need for study of other cultures and languages. Speakers of different languages in many communities provide other allies in the effort to broaden student perspectives.

Our students' current interest in the environment worldwide can also be an opening wedge to a global perspective. They and we are becoming increasingly aware that our waste can become others' problems and that there is an inherent unfairness in the dramatically skewed use of the world's resources, the United States of America being the greatest usurper.

A fifth expectation of the foreign language department (perhaps no more so than of others), is that the department and colleagues within it take on their fair share of institutional duties in addition to sharing an institutional perspective. Members may serve on computer users committees, on faculty senates, or on the curriculum, admissions, or professional development committees. Some weekend work may be required, interviewing prospective students or welcoming back alumnae or alumni. Faculty members will be club advisors to more than the language clubs, the language clubs will not always be the responsibility of the newest member of the department, and all members will be full participants in the life of the institution.

It may be because of the greater presence of foreign-born nationals who are members of language departments (and may therefore, feel somewhat like outsiders in the university or college) that frequently language professors and departments do not take their full share of college-wide responsibilities. Participation in the routine work of the institution is essential. Consistent involvement offers the possibility for greater influence in broadening the cultural mindset of colleagues and students.

Sixthly, as educators within higher education, it is necessary for all of us to be proponents of education in our communities. Yes, we will have something special to say about foreign languages and cultures, but all issues of education and education for all should be something we care about and will devote our attention to promoting in our communities. Foreign language departments need to be in close cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers in their area. It is too easy to blame poor instruction at the lower levels instead of finding ways to cooperate, strengthen, and further the education of teachers in public and private schools. Often teachers at the pre-college level have to be better teachers of language than many university professors, and much can be learned from their experience.

Presidents have a special responsibility to inform supporters and the public of the crucial nature of what we in colleges do, and, in the current critical climate in which we find ourselves, we need all the help we can get. Therefore, it is important to tell the president in person or in writing (and not forget to include the dean in your reporting) of the department's successes, projects, and new ventures. It will encourage administrators, but more importantly, give them fresh examples of student and faculty accomplishments to tell to various publics. And, who knows, the president may even run across a potential donor who shares your passion for foreign language teaching.

To return to the beginning, how do women fare in foreign language departments today? In almost every language taught in U.S. higher education, women form the majority of students, overwhelmingly so at the baccalaureate level where there are almost three females to every male degree recipient. There are also more than twice as many female master's degree recipients, and women are more than three-fifths of doctoral degree earners in languages.

Two decades of research have revealed that being the majority does not guarantee equality of experience for women in higher education. Departments and their chairs need to be aware of practices and attitudes which disadvantage or discourage female students, whether consciously or unconsciously, whether practiced by male or female instructors, and to provide for in-service education to ensure equal encouragement in learning regardless of sex.

Sometimes foreign language departments reflect female-demeaning stereotypes and practices from the cultures they teach. Examination of these issues is mandatory if the foreign language department is to serve well the majority of its students and to make careers in the field as promising for women as for men. Each department must examine its attitudes and practices toward female colleagues and students and be informed by the growing body of literature available. For fairness' sake and for the future of the world, we cannot underserve the majority of our students and colleagues.

What does a president expect from a foreign language department? That it be a true department of colleagues, that it be the best it can be in instruction and scholarship, that it cooperate with other units, that it be institutionally minded, sharing ideas and duties, and that its members take seriously their roles as educators within and beyond college walls. I might add a final footnote to colleagues: be kind to the chair; it's a tough job, and you never know when you may be called upon to fill this role.

CHAPTER 2

View from the Top: What a Liberal Arts Dean Expects from a Language Department

---

George Allan
Dickinson College

Prologue. These are unaccustomed times. The current perception that those of you who teach foreign languages are contributing something vital to the education of students is a recent and surprising turn of events. Surprising, because only a quarter century ago colleges and universities were dropping language requirements and cutting back your faculty. It has been the American way, after all, to neglect the study of languages other than our own. The citizens of a vast single-language, continent-spanning nation, tied by history, culture, and geopolitics to the other English-speaking peoples, had no need to acquire other tongues than their own and had ample power and arrogance to presume others wishing to interact with them would acquire theirs. Academic deans shed no tears while reducing the ranks of language faculty. Post-sputnik wisdom was calling for more emphasis of natural science, and the sleepy social studies departments were turning themselves into sciences as well. There was no guilt involved in reassigning language positions elsewhere; it seemed, indeed, almost one's patriotic duty to do so.

Now suddenly that's all altered. The underlying attitude has changed, at least, the groundwork of justification for how academic resources are most appropriately distributed. The concept of a global village is hardly new. A revolution in communications, electronic and propulsive, has been going on for some time, shaving weeks then hours and now seconds off the time it takes to get information or people from one end of the earth to another. Half the globe in nanoseconds by CNN, in 15 hours by SAS. This has made possible a global economy with its multinational corporations and linked national stock exchanges, and it has meant international coordination of political and military activity, a jet-setting cosmopolitan elite, and the instant worldwide diffusion of culture and technology. In the depths of wildest Borneo, one can expect Coke machines, Penney's underwear, and even CompuServe. We note these things most readily when they appear as challenges to American supremacy rather than expressions of it. So it is no wonder that only of late, with the United States losing its economic, political, and cultural primacy, that we have discovered the nearness and hence the importance of what lies beyond our shore.

Like mules, academic deans often need to be hit between the eyes with a 2x4 in order to secure their attention. These latter-day world-historical developments have done that for you. Language faculty are riding high now on the catbird seat. Even in the midst of the current rash of freezes and retrenchments, you can advocate an increase in your department's resources, speaking with the quiet arrogance once the special preserve of scientists doing defense-related research. The national interest requires leaders competent in the tongues and conceptual framings of our competitors. It would be folly to sacrifice our country's future just to save a few pennies in this year's budget. Senator Boren's ready ability to divert oodles of Defense Department budget dollars to international education and foreign languages is the first fruit of the new harvest.

So do not shilly-shally. Shake off the subservient mentality of the past, the habit foreign language chairs have of shuffling into the dean's chambers to wonder apologetically if it might be possible to get temporary funds so that a class might see the new work of some obscure foreign playwright, muttering obsequious thank-yous as you back and bow your way out after receiving half of what you sought. You are no longer the minority party in this congress, happy to settle for scoring a few wry, well-phrased points in faculty meeting debate, good at voting against change knowing that it will never be to your benefit. You're now up with catbirds, dominating the college meadowlands. Insects of opportunity are buzzing all around. Snap them up while the snapping's good!

Wise, however, is the academic department that looks first through the peephole when opportunity is knocking, and that does its snapping up with one eye on the longer-run dietary implications of too much grasshopper and insufficient fly. Deans can be cajoled and intimidated into granting you your wishes, but as when requesting things of the gods beware lest you in fact get what you requested. Some warnings, then, from the catseat. A friendly purr of advice to catbirds from a dean who loves them (Nietzsche: of course the circling hawks do not hate the little lambs; they love them, ah yes, they love them; for they find them so delectable to eat).

First Warning. You foreign language faculty are in such great demand because you are needed to teach our students foreign language skills. That's a truism if ever there was one. The college needs to be able to say to its constituents that it has internationalized its curriculum, that it is preparing students for the 21st century by equipping them to interact with non-English speakers. Especially Japanese speakers and probably Germans for economic and political reasons; and Spanish, of course, for social service jobs, or that and French also for business if the Free Trade agreement with Mexico and Canada is approved. Deans are quite content to take this as meaning sections of Business Japanese and Newspaper French. Something to go on the transcript; something that will catch the eye of a personnel officer. Something to appear in the catalog, at least one per department or program or school.

You are needed, however, for more serious work. You are needed to teach a foreign culture through its language. Students need to begin to see their world differently, to inhabit another linguistic world until habituated to its ways and to the cultural and conceptual modes that are its expressive foundation. There are intrinsic reasons for such an expansion of one's horizons, but even keeping to narrowly pragmatic reasons it is clear that nothing short of this will do. Menu German will not gain the bright young entrepreneur or diplomat the respect, insight, and self-confidence needed to engage Germans in a German way, to charm them by one's knowledge of their best writers, one's appreciation of the most recent political joke, one's grasp of the nuances of negotiating an informal meeting of minds.

You know this, of course; I'm only quoting the rhetoric of a thousand similar language department brochures. But knowing isn't doing, and when the dean offers you more staff if you will offer more Berlitz language sections, what then will you say? Beware selling your department's honor for a mess of pottage, even if it be true that without pottage there may be too few faculty to bear the department's honor honorably. My warning is that you must see clearly the dilemma of being popular for not quite the right reasons. Whatever choices you make, recognize the penalty you are having to pay and be sure you think it worth that price.

Second Warning. You are expensive. Foreign languages cannot be taught by lecturing to a silent sea of faces. For students to be active in class and for language labs to make sense, course sizes need to hover around 15. Already by 20 the group is large enough to hide in, and so constancy of interaction with each student is threatened. Your intrepid dean hires you a new faculty person in Japanese and finds with a three-course semester load that this means only 45 student enrollments. A philosophy professor would take that many in a single class, and historians can lecture to an auditorium of students and call it one-third of their semester's work. Those are not propitious odds for becoming the darling of your dean.

Don't settle for less, however, for then you will have surrendered the necessary condition of succeeding and all too soon your classes will not even be up to Berlitz quality. Yet there is a subtler surrender as well, one in which you agree that language skills need not be taught by Ph.D.s. For if a language instructor teaches only half as many students as do other humanities faculty, then paying them half as much will just about even things out. Part-time folk, and even full-timers with Master's degrees, abound: people with the requisite language skills and the willingness to work for less in salary and benefits than do tenure-track faculty. The danger here is the creation of an underclass. Not just a proletariat of non-tenurable laborers but more insidiously a skills-only instructorate.

Beware of heading down this path, for the separation of language instruction from culture instruction can be a dead end. Separate is never equal, as they used to say in Selma and Little Rock. You will have created in the midst of your department an echo of the invidious condition you as a department once suffered. Where once you were second class citizens in an university whose scientists travelled first class, now your Ph.D. literature faculty will be the elite and the language instructors their serfs, consigned to doing the grub work preparatory for the higher learning vouchsafed only to those students who have proved themselves worthy of it and to the faculty who teach them. This may not be a price worth the resulting internal animosities. Why, the dean will want to know, do we need to hire a specialist in Flaubert to teach first semester French? Be sure you know the answer.

Third Warning. If you win all your arguments and fashion a flourishing foreign language program, it will include overseas study opportunities as the jewel in its crown. First-hand experience, total and prolonged immersion in the culture of the target language, has no substitute. Whether the programs be your own or those of other institutions, you will have insisted that all the classroom interactions, the language houses and language tables, the video tapes and embassy documentaries, the TV programs plucked off satellite dishes, will not suffice. They will not suffice if culture is what is being taught, that is. For how can a different cultural world become habitual without inhabiting it?

The dean will not like the idea of so many students removed from the tax rolls for a semester or a year; their loss will need to be made up with increased freshmen enrollments or transfer students. But these are not the times to be expanding the size of a freshman class and then to realize no financial benefit from doing so. Your program is flourishing, however, and I can imagine your winning your argument about the overseas component of a quality foreign language education. So the appropriate agreement will be struck and your students go off to Tokyo, Paris, Bombay, and Khartoum to consolidate their growing cultural competence. All of them: the whole blasted junior class. And with them goes the need for all the departmental courses for which they would have enrolled that year, and for many they would have taken upon their return. A year of Spanish courses in Madrid is in itself enough to comprise a major, and so the senior year is free for other kinds of study, perhaps for completing a second major or setting up some internships. Your success, dear Dr. Frankenstein, may bring with it undesired consequences.

Your friendly dean, smiling broadly, will note the diminished need for faculty. A vital foreign language program does create a financial windfall for the general coffers of the college after all. Worse still, it is your literati, your elite, who are less needed now. For it is with the basic language courses behind them that your students set off for foreign climes, ready now to study your language's great literature and to explore its history, art, and philosophy. How wonderful to study Derrida with a French literary scholar rather than with you! So the language peons are renewed and the distinguished literary scholar upon retirement is not replaced. And all because you are doing so well.

The solution to this ironic twist to things is simple enough: don't let the students leave campus for their junior year. Or let only the best ones go, for the others are obviously not capable enough to take advantage of the opportunity. Yet this choice only adds a student dichotomy of elite and underclass to the faculty dichotomy, and thus further undermines your program. Paved with such solutions is the path to academic hell. Embrace the irony; don't flee from it. Repeat as a mantra the linkage among language instruction, cultural studies, and first-hand experience. They are together all necessary for genuinely preparing students for life in a global village. Teach this mantra to your dean.

Fourth Warning. You have colleagues in the social sciences who are as interested as you in foreign cultures and who wish their students to gain some modicum of the cultural knowledge and sensibility you seek for your own majors. The natural consequence should be cooperative ventures: interdisciplinary majors in a geographic area, team-taught courses, courses that count toward both majors, tracks within a major for students with a given foreign language emphasis. It should also mean students enrolled in your courses whose interests are not rooted in an intrinsic love for the culture they are studying but only a pragmatic one.

These outsiders all create pressures to minimalize the sort of education you have been insisting cannot be skimped. A political science major wanting a concentration in Chinese affairs would benefit from studying the Chinese language, but is there any reason why the student needs to take courses in its pre-modern literature or thought? Where simply double majoring is not possible, compromises must be made, and your colleagues will expect you come to more than half way in making them. The temptation is to tell them to buzz off, that art is long, life short, and if they want your language they will have to learn it your way.

There is truth in this, of course. The best preparation for business is probably to major as an undergraduate in a foreign language and then to pick up the business courses at the MBA level. But there is truth as well in the virtue of compromise, in getting half a loaf instead of none. Surely the alternatives are not between humanistic cultural competence devoid of business or government expertise and pragmatic competence devoid of cultural acumen. Finding a middle way that doesn't debase the values of each approach is a difficult challenge, compounded by hoary academic proclivities not to cooperate across departmental lines.

Language faculty have been quite good at biting their thumbs at other departments, including other language departments. What is lost in doing so, however, is the opportunity to build up a tissue of departmental interdependence that will serve not only students wanting to learn but faculty wanting to preserve their academic turf. Divide and conquer was probably Attila's first counsel to deans. Sometimes purity is not a virtue, for although beautiful, your program may not be sturdy enough nor fecund enough to survive a time of limited resources. Nor to deserve surviving; for disciplinary purity may be protecting an artful but therefore artificial convenience beyond the limits of its usefulness. Deans read Darwin, and so should you: miscegenation contributes to the health of a species, isolation and overspecialization to its demise.

Fifth Warning. You curse an educational system and a culture that breed college freshmen who don't even know English grammar, who haven't read a novel voluntarily since they finished *The House at Pooh Corner*, who think Alexander the Great is a drink, and who don't know that FDR is someone's initials. American students these days seem to be growing more and more undisciplined and unmotivated academically, and thus less and less able to think clearly, argue cogently, appraise perceptively, or discriminate aesthetically. Since such basic cultural knowledge and learning skills are especially crucial in foreign language acquisition of the quality you seek, the deficiencies of today's students are particularly galling for you.

Griping about students is a pleasant pastime, but such idle Faculty Club fun drifts imperceptibly into a serious disdain of them and too often eventually wrecks on the rocks of patronizing contempt—first of one's students, then of one's teaching and institution, penultimately of one's discipline, and ultimately of one's self. The antidote is to become involved in your institution's general education efforts. Foreign language faculty often seek to be excused from teaching freshman seminars or core courses because such courses are taught in English. But you speak English, don't you? If so, you can teach courses using it, even where it is not your native tongue. The point is that, short of a miracle, the only response to a widespread failing in our society is to do something about it in a context where you have influence: your department and your university.

Deans like departments that contribute actively and ungrudgingly to the general education needs of their college. Students who meet you in such contexts may even be led to try you out in a language course, and colleagues you meet there may even have ideas, pedagogical and scholarly, from which you will benefit. Besides, griping without doing anything about it produces dyspepsia. And if the choice is between sullen foreign language faculty and cheerful chemistry faculty, maybe the old distribution of positions wasn't such a bad idea after all.

Postlogue. Typical of a dean. I have warned you that to survive, you and your departmental colleagues, separately and together, must take your teaching very seriously. You must figure out what quality education means in your field and then pursue it without succumbing to an endless array of debased alternatives. I have also warned you that hoisting pedagogical excellence to the top of your petard will only hoist you up as well unless you are politically astute in securing the support of colleagues in other disciplines. Political astuteness means the art of compromise; but for it to be astute the compromise must be without sacrifice of standards and essentials. I have not mentioned, because it should need no mention, that you must also remain active as a scholar and not only a scholar of the pedagogy of your field. If you slip in that regard, don't expect deans and faculty personnel committees to be forgiving.

Unfair, unfair. Not really: you ask the same impossible things of your students, scaled down to be sure, but otherwise the same. Furthermore, of those to whom much has been given much is expected, and you have been given for a time, two times, and half a time the blessed gift of being thought to be teaching the most important subject in the curriculum. If you rise to the challenge, deans will thank you but not loud nor long, for we have budgets to prepare, presidents to soothe, and departments that think you are already benefitting unfairly at their expense. In lieu of praise, you'll have to settle for the self-respect that comes from knowing you are doing the best you can. Perhaps a quarter century hence some former student will look you up, shake your palsied hand, and, in that foreign tongue you love so well, whisper you a heartfelt thanks. And that beats deanly thank-yous any day!

CHAPTER 3

View from the Top: What a Graduate School Dean Expects from a Language Department

Daniel R. Reedy
University of Kentucky

Whatever the motivation that leads a faculty member to assume the responsibilities of department chair, be it in units as diverse as a department of foreign languages or one of biological sciences, the characteristics of an effective chair differ inconsequentially from one unit to another. Certain attributes of the successful chairperson are generally common to unit administrators throughout the university, although some persons may measure higher in one strength than in another. Most of us who have served as department chair recognize that the task is not unlike that of Sisyphus, constantly trying to push a heavy load onward and upward. Unlike Sisyphus, however, we should not see these responsibilities as punishment for offending the gods; rather, they should be regarded as an important opportunity to manage the affairs of the department efficiently while providing a focal point of leadership for enhancing the program's quality in its instructional, research, and service roles.

Qualities often recognized as essential for department chairs in the abstract are tenacity, patience, and virtue, thus making them emulate the paradigms of Penelope and Lucretia. Yet other qualities are of equal importance, particularly honesty and reasonable forthrightness in interaction with deans or other administrators, as well as with faculty colleagues, students, and other constituents. No single administrative shortcoming is as great, perhaps, as the failure to deal candidly with those to whom you report or with those for whom you are responsible in the authority chain. When confronted by a disgruntled colleague or nonplussed student, it becomes all too easy to hedge the response or dodge the problem with a non-committal or less than direct reply. This ruse may work a few times, but such inconsistencies inevitably come back to revisit the chair at some future date.

Good managerial skills are not necessarily an innate part of a new chair's background, but they can be acquired. Most experienced chairs devote at least a significant segment of each week to administrative duties while zealously maintaining some allocation of time for their own instructional and research activities. (Remember that you will likely return to the faculty ranks at the end of your term.) Inefficient management of time usually means that administrative duties may consume the chair's hours in the office and dominate much of his/her time outside the institutional domain as well. Completing reports for the dean before the due date, being responsive to students and faculty needs, answering correspondence in a timely manner, and budgeting time for other administrative duties on a regular basis are essential if one is to enjoy a non-administrative life. I recall a foreign language department chair in a large state university whose lack of timely response to correspondence from prospective graduate students resulted in few new students and teaching assistants for the next academic year. Unanswered and unopened letters had gathered dust in stacks of correspondence on his desk. (His tenure as department chair ended with his second year in office.)

The chair's ability to provide leadership will be constantly tested, but the well-being and future of the department and its programs may ride in the balance. Strategic planning in collaboration with one's faculty colleagues is paramount. What are the research and instructional strengths in the department on which solid future programs can be built? What improvements can be made in existing baccalaureate and graduate degree programs? Do they meet the needs of students entering the professional job market? What can be done to recruit better quality graduate students? Are the department's objectives in keeping with the stated goals of the college or university? Do the faculty understand and support the needs of constituent groups and are they prepared professionally to meet those needs? In providing leadership for the future, the department chair may well conclude that it is easier to set the agenda him/herself (as a hallmark of personal or professional accomplishment), but the effective chair recognizes the value of collaborative involvement of faculty (and students) in the process. Unless they are partners in the formulation of goals and objectives, they will likely demonstrate little interest in or desire to contribute to strategies to achieve them. A leadership style which values "we" over "I" or "they" most often leads to administrative success.

Whether in interaction with the college or graduate dean, the department chair often feels gripped like a spring in the jaws of a vise. One pressure point is constituted by departmental colleagues whose views deserve to be represented, and the other is the senior administrator whose perspective may not coincide accordingly. As leader of the department, the chair must represent the view of colleagues, when they are reasoned and legitimate, while trying to convince the administrator above that they have credence and are worthy of due consideration. In times of budget reductions or when other difficult decisions must be made within a university or college environment, the chair must be prepared to communicate decisions by senior administrators to faculty colleagues and other constituents as objectively as possible. All too often, the easier course of action is to posit the situation as "us against them". Portraying the dean to one's faculty as an ambitious, entrenched, power-oriented administrator (even though he/she is), may work for a while, but it will likely lead to an ineffectual relationship with the senior administrator to the potential detriment of a department. Thus, the role of the chair as spokesperson and arbitrator—"the spring in the vise"—is not unlike that of the negotiator of a diplomatic treaty. Somewhere in the process, between opposing viewpoints, a position may be found which is reasonably acceptable to both sides.

Maintaining collegial relationships with one's colleagues is another expectation of the department chair. Do they, the staff, and students perceive the chair as an antagonist or as someone in whom they can confide with a sense of trust? Ferreting out information about colleagues' personal lives is not advisable, but the good administrator notices when a colleague or staff member is not performing at a customary level of achievement. Personal problems such as illness, divorce, financial woes, interpersonal relationships, and job dissatisfaction can all diminish productive professional lives. Sympathetic, caring, and non-judgmental interactions are the most appropriate response; give them time and support to get their lives back on track. This approach is effective also in assisting faculty colleagues in their professional development. Advocacy for their legitimate desires for advancement, letters of recommendation for fellowships or other awards, sponsorship of their petition for sabbatical or leave time, and constructive approaches to remedying their shortcomings are important contributions to their professional well-being and effective performance in the department. Their success will reflect favorably on the perception of the chair's administrative effectiveness.

The role and responsibilities of a graduate dean in most colleges and universities are generally distinct from those of academic deans of a college. Whereas the chair of a department reports directly to a college dean or other officer, particularly as it relates to personnel matters, interaction with the graduate dean is usually concerning issues related to graduate curriculum, graduate students, graduate faculty, and the research environment of the institution. The graduate dean has broad responsibility for the enhancement of scholarship and research on the campus while playing an advocacy role in the central administration on issues relating to graduate education. Other duties include administrative support services such as institutional dissemination of information about all graduate programs. Depending on the administrative authority of the graduate dean, he/she may play an important role in recommending budgetary support for teaching assistants or in advocating increasing numbers of TAs or RAs. As well, the graduate dean's office usually has fellowship funds available for non-service support of outstanding graduate students throughout the university.

In some institutions, the graduate dean has a key role in interaction with the academic ombudsperson or legal counsel and department chair when charges of cheating, plagiarism, scientific misconduct, or intellectual dishonesty are brought against a graduate student. In this function, the graduate dean must be an advocate for graduate student rights while being mindful of the institution's intellectual and procedural integrity. Interactions between the graduate dean and department chair in today's educational environment may come as well from charges of misconduct or harassment of graduate students by faculty members. If the student is also an employee (TA/RA) of the department, the dean of the graduate school may be the likely person to hear these charges first rather than the department chair. Allegations of inappropriate fraternization and sexual harassment continue to surface in greater numbers today than ever before.

The main linkage of a graduate degree-granting department to the graduate school is primarily related to the admission and degree certification of graduate students. This connection may be through a person designated as director of graduate studies for the foreign language department, or it may be the chair who exercises this role. Through a graduate council or other representative body of faculty members, each graduate program may recommend admissions standards for graduate students, except that minimum expectations may not be less than those of the graduate school. Such is true, as well, for the certification of degree requirements. Together, the graduate faculty of a program and the graduate council set degree requirements, with the dean of the graduate school charged to determine that these requirements are met by graduates.

Regular review of recommended changes in graduate curricula or new degree programs falls under the purview of the graduate council, the dean, and in some cases the graduate faculty of the institution. Additionally, periodic reviews of departments and of their degree programs involve the graduate school and its council. In such reviews, a committee (composed of internal or external representatives—some perhaps external to the institution itself) examines and evaluates the quality of the graduate faculty, their professional productivity, their role in meeting the goals of the graduate program, the quality of students being admitted to the department, and the success of its graduates. In times of financial retrenchment and mandated assessment of program outcomes, all departments may expect close monitoring in terms of effectiveness, i.e., the quality of the product which they produce.

Most colleges and universities have clearly established standards for determining which faculty members may teach graduate level courses, direct theses, or supervise doctoral dissertations, although criteria for membership on the graduate faculty may vary from institution to institution. These criteria are usually monitored by accrediting agencies such as the regional Associations of Colleges and Schools. To carry out graduate education responsibilities, faculty should usually hold the doctor's degree or its equivalent in scholarly reputation and should be at the rank of assistant professor or higher. As well, graduate faculty members should demonstrate scholarly maturity and professional productivity as demonstrated by publications or other creative activities appropriate to the position. In recommending to the graduate dean that a faculty member be appointed to the graduate faculty, the chair should have clearly in mind the instructional role and other responsibilities which the graduate faculty member will be expected to carry out within the department. Consultation between department chair and graduate dean on these matters is often beneficial in the appointment process.

In planning for future development of the department's graduate programs or in determining which positions should be filled when they become vacant, the chair and faculty need to examine carefully the long-range needs of the program. The hiring of a specialist in Catalan studies may add an important new dimension to the graduate program, but does it leave vacant a more important need in linguistics or 20th-century fiction? Again, interaction between the chair, dean of the college, and graduate dean may be beneficial in future hires. When recruiting a person to meet responsibilities at the graduate level, department chairs would be well-advised to include the graduate dean in the interview process. Have candidates already completed requirements for the doctorate? Do they have a research agenda that is consonant with programmatic needs and graduate student interests? Do they show promise of being granted tenure within a reasonable length of time, depending on the institution's minimum standards? Are they likely to continue to be professionally active once tenure and higher rank are achieved? These are among the questions which graduate deans will inevitably ask when the promotion/tenure dossier is reviewed in their office.

The department chair and dean of the graduate school share an important responsibility—the latter at the institutional level, the former at the unit level—to champion values and ethics in graduate education, integrity in the scholarship of faculty and students, the promotion of cultural diversity, and the enhancement of intellectual collegiality. High sounding as these goals may be, department chair and dean are responsible for collaborative efforts to achieve them by establishing policies which lead to good practice in graduate education, to the development of high quality curricula, to standards of excellence in student selection, and to rigor in graduate faculty appointments.

As dean without portfolio, graduate deans are often more political than administrative figures, thus serving as brokers within the college or university for issues of academic quality. Their ability to advocate high quality graduate education within the department or institution is largely dependent on a sense of values shared with the faculty. When faculty quality is high, they hold a concomitant expectation of quality outcomes from the students they admit to their programs and from those who receive degrees under their tutelage. To this end, the standards of department chairs and of their colleagues will largely determine the overall quality of their graduate program. Without a shared sense of educational values among graduate faculty, department chair, graduate dean, and other administrators, graduate programs will seldom attain the level of success of which they are potentially capable.

CHAPTER 4

Raison d'être: Foreign Languages and the Liberal Arts Today

Murray Sachs
Brandeis University

Historically, ours is an ancient and noble calling. Many venerable figures whose names have come down to us as great leaders—Moses, Aristotle, Jesus, Augustine, Maimonides, Erasmus, to cite only a few—attracted followers because they had the knowledge and the knack of persuasively interpreting texts, sacred or profane, for those who could not read, or did not know, the language in which those texts were written. For their time and place, the role of such leaders was essentially that of a teacher of language and literature, though that role was, for obvious reasons, much more central to those civilizations than it can be to ours today.

Not only ancient leaders but also ancient texts warrant the antiquity of our calling. For example, the biblical account of the tower of Babel (*Genesis*, chapter 11, verses 1-9) can quite legitimately be viewed as the "myth of origin" for our profession, since it "explains" the existence of many languages as a confounding of human language by divine decree, lest the creative achievements which a common language makes possible instill in humans the arrogant ambition to rival God's creation some day. What is often overlooked in this myth—though not, of course, by foreign language teachers—is the enormous creative power it attributes to language. The lesson we take from this myth is that it is our mission to counter the confusion of languages and restore communication among peoples, thus unleashing more fully the power of the word, wherein resides the secret of human achievement. For the contemporary world, a modernized mission statement might read: to liberate human beings from the isolating confines of the prison which knowledge of but one language has become, and thus to enlarge human consciousness to include more than one way of thinking about, and understanding, our common world and our common humanity. So defined, the mission of our profession can claim both true nobility of purpose and the dignity of a venerable origin and a distinguished history.

American colleges and universities, however, in this closing decade of the twentieth century, give scant recognition to our claim of dignity or of nobility of purpose. At least since World War II, our profession has been receiving a succession of contradictory signals, based on expediency, from the general public, from government, from academic administrators, and from students, with regard to what our mission is perceived to be. In times of national peril—the outbreak of war (Korea, Vietnam), a technological revolution abroad (the Soviet space program, symbolized by Sputnik, or the Japanese electronic hegemony), a political crisis abroad (the 1979 take-over of our Embassy in Iran, the collapse of the Soviet Union), or an economic disaster (the loss of America's competitive edge in world markets)—the signals we receive are urgent assertions that we are necessary for national security, and even more urgent, often impatient, demands that we produce, for the nation, legions of competent speakers of German or Russian or Farsi or Japanese, depending on the particular crisis at hand. In calmer times, and especially when the national economy is becalmed or in recession, the signals we receive tend to be exactly opposite: the study of foreign languages contributes little that is tangible to our national educational goals, and the resources devoted to such study might more productively be applied to such practical studies as medicine, engineering, or business.

This cyclical waxing and waning of interest in, and enthusiasm for, foreign language study, both within and without the academy, has had painful and paradoxical consequences for our profession, afflicting two generations of foreign language teachers with a most unsettling and intractable dilemma. The waxing of interest in our discipline, for example, may appear to support foreign language teachers in their insistence on their own importance, but in fact, being crisis-driven, this awakened interest actually imposes a temporary and highly disruptive alteration of their curriculum on foreign language teachers, deflecting them from their purpose while, at the same time, darkly implying that the profession's neglect of duty and methodological incompetence were to blame for the crisis in the first place. The periods of waning interest, on the other hand, bring on draconian budget cuts by administrators, in which are implicit both the accusation of failure by foreign language teachers to carry out their mission successfully, and the ultimate menace of possible oblivion for a profession suddenly being viewed as irrelevant to the educational mission of a modern institution of higher learning.

The most frustrating aspect of this acute dilemma ("are we necessary, or are we irrelevant?") is that it has exposed to public view, and aggravated, a long-standing and highly divisive internal dispute in many departments of foreign languages, which has now taken on the dimensions of a professional identity crisis. Indeed, most departments today are driven by the conflicting demands of students, administrators, and the general public, and by the conflicting views of their own members regarding the educational philosophy most appropriate to our discipline. The current atmosphere, nationally, in our profession is one of bewilderment, fragmentation, and anxiety about the future. The most painful irony is that it does not seem to matter whether a department's current enrollments are waxing or waning, or whether the level of student interest is high or low; the only real issue, which preoccupies and bedevils all of us, is how to define the department's mission in these troubled times, how to explain to an uncertain and ill-informed public our *raison d'être*. For what has been shattered in all of the recent ideological turmoil is the confident sense our profession once had that ours is a noble and respected calling whose clearly defined mission belongs, without question, at the very heart of American higher education. Such confidence in the clarity and integrity of our mission no longer seems viable in today's academy. The compulsively repetitious wrangling that has gone on in college faculties, since the 1950s, over the definition and the very existence of a foreign language requirement for graduation, is the clearest symptom we have of the drastic change of status which has overtaken foreign language study in colleges and universities.

How has it come about that, in so short a time, foreign language teachers have journeyed from a secure place at the core of the college curriculum to an unstable position on the margins, where we are faced each day—as it seems to us—with the Sisyphean task of satisfying once again the implicit demand of our colleagues and students that we justify our existence? However weary we may be of pushing that particular boulder up the hill again, we must remind ourselves that the alternative is, after all, unthinkable. Under such circumstances, it is surely worth rehearsing a bit of hoary education history in order to understand contextually what is now happening to the academy and to our discipline, and to chart, with some wisdom, a viable course for ourselves in the future.

We must look back at least as far as the beginning of the medieval university, to have an adequate measure of our discipline's long fall from academic grace. In those days, foreign language study constituted, in a sense, the entire university curriculum. The two-part curriculum—the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy)—making up the liberal arts, were without exception text-based, and most texts were composed in Latin or Greek. To study, therefore, was to read the [foreign language] texts considered authoritative for each discipline. Knowledge was at first simply defined as what was recorded in those authoritative texts. A gradual change in that definition of knowledge came about, as the information in certain kinds of authoritative texts which could be readily summarized was assimilated into common knowledge (e.g., basic treatises on medicine, law, or science) to the point that those texts no longer needed to be studied. There resulted a system which recognized two kinds of knowledge: the accepted truths and facts basic to certain disciplines, a knowledge that was no longer text-based; and the understanding of, and familiarity with, major works of historical, philosophical, or literary import, whose contents could not adequately be made available by means of a reductive summary, a knowledge that was, therefore, still inescapably text-based, since those texts yielded their knowledge only through close study.

Those two kinds of knowledge, which at first tended merely to separate the *trivium* from the *quadrivium*, evolved over the centuries into what we now recognize as the arts and humanities, on the one hand, and the physical and social sciences on the other. Foreign languages, of course, no longer constituted the whole curriculum, but were subsumed under the humanities, as a specialized, text-based discipline. In modern times, there has been a proliferation of new disciplines, and a manifold expansion in both kinds of knowledge, forcing upon colleges and universities the obligation of periodic curriculum review, in order to decide what new disciplines deserved to be recognized in the overall curriculum, and what knowledge remained so central to our ability to understand our world and ourselves that it must be retained in the core of required studies that constitute a college's General Education Program. We are all familiar with the consequences of this curricular review process: over the course of the twentieth century, *all* disciplines have had to accept a smaller and smaller share of students' time, and have had to redefine repeatedly what is essential and what is expendable in the discipline, since full curricular coverage in depth has become an impossibility in every field of knowledge. Foreign language study has, of course, not been exempted from any of these forms of diminished "presence" in the college curriculum. Certain other, quite recent phenomena, such as the rapid increase in the percentage of high school students who go on to college, the spread of doctrines like semiotics and deconstruction which challenge the notion that language is capable of communicating decidable meaning, and the consciousness-expanding campaigns which challenge the notion of a traditional canon of significant texts, have also exerted pressure, intentionally or unintentionally, for curricular change which has further diminished the role of many disciplines, foreign languages included.

The growing interest in interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge is perhaps the most significant index of the kinds of far-reaching changes that are taking place in the academy, prompting the sometimes radical redefinition of the disciplines, and blurring all of the old boundary lines between departments, disciplines, schools, and modes of critical and analytical investigation. It is all of these forces—and more—which have pushed foreign language study (along with the rest of the humanities) away from the central core and out to the margins of the college curriculum, and which have brought to the surface the severe identity crisis that seems to me to be shaking the confidence of departments of foreign languages in the validity of their traditional *raison d'être*.

These would indeed seem to be bleak days for foreign language departments in American colleges and universities, and the problems of chairing such a department in the present atmosphere might well seem daunting. Yet I believe that the vast spectrum of change now unfolding in the academy is best understood, not as a threat to our profession, but as a unique opportunity to reassert our rightful place in the educational process, and to remake a consensus within our own ranks that will take us into the twenty-first century strong and united in purpose. Let it be said unequivocally that the forces of change are firmly in the ascendancy, and seem to me to be irreversible. That we are going to *have* to change is now incontrovertible—that is our fate, which we share with all our fellow academics, in all the disciplines. *How* we change, however, will be very much up to us—this is our opportunity, and we should not let it slip away.

It should be emphasized that there is no evidence, so far as I know, that foreign language departments have been singled out for special hardships. Everything I read and hear tells me that the pain of change is being spread rather evenly throughout the academy. What may, nevertheless, prove to be a greater hardship for us than for others—though it was not so intended—is the steady reduction in the share of students' time that is available to us. The difficulty, for the modern languages especially, is that the discipline is, by nature, what might be called "time-intensive," i.e., it takes many hours of study and practice to attain proficiency in all four skills of a foreign language. Yet, from another perspective, this difficulty might be seen as a blessing in disguise. It is, after all, physically impossible to allot to foreign language programs the amount of class time we feel they need. That has been the case for years, and the problem is inevitably getting worse and not better. Should that not suggest to us that, since we cannot achieve our goals under present conditions, and will be even less able to achieve them in the future, since time is not a commodity we can ever hope to control, what we ought to do is change our goals? The "four-skills" goal in language study is surely a luxury we can no longer afford, as is the "full coverage in depth" goal in literary and cultural study. If we insist on those goals, we doom ourselves to perpetual failure.

Why not set goals we *can* reach, in the class hours available to us? Opinions differ on what such goals should be, but my recommendation, which falls outside the beliefs held by most individuals currently in the profession, would be that, in language instruction, we aim for the acquisition of the rudiments of grammar and a really solid reading capability, stressing all the while the linguistics perspective by which the student becomes fully aware that the language being learned is a complete thought and communication system, comparable to, but in significant ways different from, the student's native language. In such a course, the student comes away with a durable and highly pragmatic skill: the ability to read, and a theoretical and practical understanding of why the speakers of other languages do not perceive or comprehend the world in exactly the same way as we do—a truly mind-enlarging idea. Once the student's reading skill is strong enough to tackle literature, I would recommend limiting the choice of texts to be studied to those works the teacher feels are absolutely seminal in nature, within the culture of the language being studied, and therefore most likely to be part of the literary knowledge of any educated native speaker of the language. In that way, the student will take away some genuine insight into the mentality and outlook of the people whose language is being studied, and will have attained a degree of literacy in that culture that approximates that of the average educated native speaker of that language. Again, the student's gain is truly mind-enlarging, assisting in the process of freeing the student from the unilingual prison in a most concrete and practical way.

Since we are now clearly obliged to make some hard choices, I would advocate going all out for the reading skill, since that will, in my view, pay the richest and the longest-lasting educational dividends. As in the medieval university, so in our contemporary institutions of higher learning, the reading of seminal texts still seems to me the surest road to true knowledge. The emphasis I am recommending will also demonstrate to students, colleagues, and public a conception of our mission which comes as close as the modern world can to fulfilling the noble tradition of our ancient calling: to counter the confusion of languages by restoring communication between people, to release as fully as possible, for each individual, the power of the word, and to enlarge human consciousness through direct contact with another way of thinking about, and understanding, our world and ourselves.

Perhaps the greatest value of such an approach is that our teaching could become—as it surely should be—a genuinely subversive activity. Is not the goal of a liberal arts education to disturb and unsettle the young mind, to challenge the complacency of received opinion, and to expose students to alternate ways of thinking? Who can do that more effectively than the foreign language teacher, whose very mission it is to lead students out of the solipsistic comforts of one's native language, and into the strange new vision and thought of another linguistic system? That kind of "leading out" to the unknown is the very essence of education, as the etymology of the word suggests. Why should we not incorporate that essential idea, explicitly, into the way we describe and practice our profession?

Can this particular approach to teaching a foreign language that I am advocating be expected to make anyone a better person? Not if what is meant is a better person morally—that is beyond the reach of any educational technique yet devised. But this approach can make anyone a better *educated* person, which is to say, someone better able to comprehend and appreciate our world than the person would be without it. That seems to me no paltry claim, and I hope that, by the twenty-first century, under the gentle guidance of those who may chair foreign language departments in the near future, a consensus will have been reached by the members of our profession to include that proud claim in every public statement of our *raison d'être*.

CHAPTER 5

Administering Graduate Programs

Ivan A. Schulman
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

American universities and colleges find themselves constrained today by a fiscal crisis which in turn has generated a programmatic and curricular dialogue about values and priorities in graduate education. In the wake of this involuntary, vexing debate, restrictive budgets that are wreaking havoc with the quality of our instructional programs have become the general rule. This clearly is not the first period of economic constraint in higher education, nor is it likely to be the last. However, current budgetary difficulties present singular micro characteristics that refract seemingly unique macro socioeconomic problems tied to our post-industrial culture. The reflection of these problems in the university environment can be observed, for example, in the frequent admonitions of university administrators that the paring down of today's budgets, in amounts varying from 8 to 25 percent, will more than likely not see a turn-around. That is, the reductions need to be viewed as permanent, and that, furthermore, future budgetary modifications will have to come about in the form of internal reallocations. Haggling over such internal readjustments comes at a time of heightened anti-intellectualism coupled with a strident, myopic critique of the value of academic research, a citizens' revolt against higher taxes to maintain and improve the quality of higher education, a demand for fiscal and personal accountability—especially in the arena of instruction, and a call for the reduction of university expenditures in line with the budgetary downsizing of both government agencies and private enterprises in response to the exigencies of a faltering world-wide economy.

For foreign languages and literatures departments, these colliding social, economic, and cultural problems have forced a reconsideration of the priorities, objectives, and composition of graduate programs in a period of diminishing resources with regard to budgets, faculty, and student applications. Some faculty reductions are the result of retirements—due to peak in exceptionally large numbers in the next five years; others stem from departures without the customary replacements of lines or positions. Where these reappointments have been approved by deans, they have been restricted by and large to entry level positions. The reduction in student numbers has been driven by economic factors. That is, since most foreign language graduate degrees, particularly at the doctoral level, prepare students for a career in college or university teaching and research,[1] and since salaries in higher education have not kept pace with those in other professions—e.g., law, medicine, business—talented students have gravitated to the study of other disciplines with the result that within a generation we will be faced, all things remaining equal, with a constantly diminishing pool of quality students who will be preparing themselves to educate the future generations of secondary and university students in this country.

Diminutions in the student body have also been the inevitable result of the downsizing of departmental budgets, especially funds for temporary or part-time instruction normally reserved for the hiring of Graduate Assistants. And since the number of Graduate Assistants, especially in larger universities, determines the number of graduate students that a given program can sustain, cuts in assistantship budgets such as those presently being experienced in most institutions across the country mean that graduate student bodies will (indeed, *have*) become smaller, thus providing the future student bodies at colleges and universities with a potentially smaller number of faculty in language and literature departments. This shrinkage is occurring in a time of rising consciousness of the importance of instructional programs that deal with the problems of multiculturalism, an increased interest in the study of foreign languages and literatures, and curricular reforms of foreign language teacher preparation programs—all of which will of necessity require larger budgetary outlays. Hence, in the face of today's faltering finances, departmental executive officers need to assume convincing postures with deans and vice presidents in arguing for a larger share of programmatic dollars. As humanists we must describe and defend our needs and those of our students with greater insistence than in the past or, as in the past, we will be passed over in the distribution of funds in favor of our colleagues in the social sciences or the natural sciences.

The Pressures of Balance. The classical tradition of curricular balance has been held up as a model in constructing and maintaining graduate foreign languages and literatures programs. However, in an age of flux and rapid change in educational demands and pressures, foreign language departments might well consider other paradigms, ones that are more responsive to student interests, to transformations in disciplinary canons, and to the advisability of specializing more in one area of instruction and research instead of reaching for a sometimes utopian concept of harmony and balance, particularly when resources are scarce. It is not our intent to argue against balance per se, but rather to suggest that each department in micro managing its programs would do well to take stock of its strengths, its resources, its library holdings, its community responsibilities and relationships, its educational mission, and build program priorities accordingly.

The threats to balance cannot be attributed on an exclusionary basis to today's crisis. On the contrary. They have been a perennial source of conflict and concern in foreign language departments in which the rivalries within literature and linguistics programs are proverbial: conflict between applied linguistics and formal linguistics, Spanish and Spanish American literary studies, French and Spanish, Germanic and Romance, basic language instruction and advanced undergraduate or graduate instruction. These rivalries have plagued the development and administration of both graduate and undergraduate programs and often prevented departments from achieving the modicum of collegiality indispensable for the development and enrichment of their programs.

Over the years, the search for balance has created other sources of conflict. There is the perennial conundrum of deciding how much of its resources a department should devote to graduate studies and how much to undergraduate programs. The decision is not an easy one, and no pat answer can be developed that will apply to the particular circumstances of every institution and department. Even in large "research universities" with departmental student registrations of 5,000 or more, there is usually a very clearly defined mission to serve the undergraduate student body. Pressures from either state legislators, state residents, alumni, or parents can create intense pressures to privilege the needs of the undergraduate population. How, it can be asked, should a department decide the amount of instructional time and/or funding to be set aside for graduate instruction? The decision can be painful, but in our opinion, it must be made on the basis of the department's previously formulated commitment to support M.A. and/or Ph.D. instruction.

When well mounted graduate programs are in place—and have been for many years—, and when there are students in these programs, it becomes the responsibility, not merely of the department but of the administration, to see that there is a level of support appropriate to providing meaningful instruction at the graduate level, while providing as much as is reasonably possible for undergraduate studies. All of this suggests that in departments with both graduate and undergraduate instruction there needs to be a clear understanding between the appropriate dean and the department regarding a minimum level of funding for *both* areas of instructional activity. Having established this basic principle as a *sine qua non*, the executive officer of a department and the faculty must think imaginatively about maximizing resources so that courses, workshops, proseminars and seminars for graduate students can be offered on a regular basis without vitiating diverse quality instruction at the undergraduate level. Such devices as team teaching, the cycling of courses, a controlled program of individual study courses, or the scheduling of selected classes each semester that serve both undergraduate and graduate constituencies can help to expand sparse resources.

The Role of Research. Graduate instruction without an attendant faculty commitment to meaningful scholarly research is a contradiction in terms. Courses at the graduate level, if they are to fulfill the mission for which they are intended, that is, to provide professional training in a given discipline, must be taught by practitioners of the art of scholarship who are involved in "cutting-edge" professional dialogues, whether they be in French nineteenth-century literature, the contemporary Spanish American novel, or second language acquisition. Faculty at the graduate level need to engage their students in a lively interchange whose purpose cannot be limited to passing on information; from the critical dialogue there should emerge new insights into the further development of knowledge in the field: new literary readings, new linguistic theories—all of which implies that on the part of both faculty and students there exists a willingness to go beyond authority, to expand the horizons of a discipline. Faculty, in addition, have the responsibility, in meaningful graduate education, to eschew their self-conception as repositories of all knowledge and be willing to accept new ideas that suggest themselves from the community of concepts to which well prepared graduate students contribute. The unwillingness to abandon the *magister dixit* complex on the part of many, if not most humanists, is damaging to the continued fruitful development of graduate studies and stands in sharp contrast with the cooperative, insightful experiences more commonly shared by senior and junior researchers in graduate science programs.

Active participation in research implies that those who are teaching in graduate programs need to have adequate time to carry on such research and not be overburdened with departmental committee duties, or with so many class preparations that time for reading, thinking, and writing becomes impossible. Hence, in a department which has a faculty not all of whose members participate in graduate instruction, there should be a two-tiered teaching load in place. In large "research universities" the assumption needs to be made that all of the faculty are involved in serious research activities and that they are communicating the results of that research to their graduate students. Hence, their teaching load should perforce be lighter than those in a department of an institution that regards its primary or exclusive function as providing undergraduate instruction. Distinctions in teaching load are not intended to establish hierarchies; they should not be interpreted as value judgments with regard to the superiority of one activity or another. For whether it is graduate or undergraduate instruction that is being imparted, all faculty have an obligation, in our opinion, to prepare carefully and teach with enthusiasm so as to capture the students' interest and inspire them to greater heights of understanding and knowledge. Both undergraduate and graduate courses require meticulous planning; without it, resources of both time and personnel are wasted.

There is one further dimension of research that merits exploration in this relatively brief overview: the responsibility that faculty involved in graduate instruction must assume in mentoring graduate students. All too frequently, this task has been embraced in a very haphazard fashion in most departments. There is an ever-increasing need to work with students individually, "hands on," so to speak, to initiate them into the problems of conducting research, to show them the opportunities for communicating their research to the members of the profession at large, to sensitize them to issues of professional ethics—both in research and teaching, and, finally, to introduce them to the strategies for successful grant application. Today's need to invest more personal time with graduate students stems in large measure from two insufficiencies: 1) A prevailing lack of knowledge among graduate students—even among those in doctoral programs—about the profession, including what faculty members do with their time, how research should be integrated into departmental teaching programs, how faculty gain access to participation in professional meetings, which professional journals accept different types of articles, how one applies for teaching positions, how to interview for such positions, etc.; and 2) The lack of sophistication and elegance in communicating research in written form, or, stated alternatively, the disturbing problem of writing, so much on the mind of those concerned with curricular problems at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. With regard to the second point, it is imperative that faculty members ask their graduate students to do significant amounts of writing in all courses *prior* to their reaching dissertation stage. In addition, such written assignments need to be read not merely for the content, but for the style as well. And, when the latter is deficient, faculty should spend time with their students to enrich their writing skills. Writing across the curriculum has been identified today as an undergraduate problem at most educational institutions. And, at that level it is receiving a fair amount of attention. But we also need to deal with this problem at the graduate level. If we wait until dissertation stage, it will be too late for our students to learn what traditionally should have been acquired either in secondary school or in undergraduate studies.

In addition to training in writing, departments should provide graduate students, particularly those at Ph.D. level, with the experience of delivering formal papers. In other words, students should be taught to understand the difference between a spoken/read paper and a written manuscript. This goal can be met through different types of activities: by organizing student colloquia (preferably arranged by the students themselves); or by having faculty set up periodic meetings at which revised papers that students have written for courses, grouped according to disciplinary interest, are presented to student-faculty groups. Either or both of these activities will help graduate students sharpen their oral presentation skills. However, just as in the case of writing, so with respect to the delivery of spoken/read papers: faculty must assume an active mentoring role and work in close cooperation with those students whose skills in this professional area need upgrading.

The Role of Advising. Advising graduate students in today's educational environment should imply more than simply assisting students in choosing courses. The multiplicity of tracks or programs within M.A. and Ph.D. curricula has grown to a degree that students, even those with fairly definite career choices, are often confused—M.A., M.A.T., Ph.D.—with a specialization in literature, linguistics, or applied linguistics. And within all of these degrees, the disciplinary subsets. It is important that every department have a faculty member responsible for the over-all functioning of the graduate program, preferably a Director of Graduate Studies. To administer such a program, the faculty member should receive released time (at least one course per year under a semester system; two under a quarter system). The director needs to work with a full-time secretary if the program has more than forty graduate students enrolled in it, for it will fall to his/her lot to answer queries from prospective students, file forms with the graduate college, work cooperatively with both the executive officer of the department and the undergraduate advisor to make sure there is a proper balance of courses in the department as a whole, and to assure a sufficient spread of courses for the various graduate constituencies of the department.

Although the Director of Graduate Studies should be responsible for organizing the recruitment of graduate students and the general supervision of the program, one of his/her principal roles is to see to it that the students receive proper advising from *all* of the faculty members of the department. Some departments ask the Director of Graduate Studies to assume the full task of advising all students. At the University of Illinois we tried this; that is, we had the director advise all students except for those who had chosen a Ph.D. dissertation advisor. Our experience was negative with regard to this practice. Students complained they were not receiving focused, specialized advising in terms of their ultimate career goal. Thus, we currently distribute students among all faculty members according to two broad classifications—literature and linguistics. Advanced Ph.D. students take their advising from their Director of Dissertation Research. This arrangement, so far, has functioned well, and it has the added advantage of engaging all the faculty in the administration of the graduate program.

The Function of Proseminars. We began this section by noting that advising should not be conceived as being limited to course selection or, by extension, to counseling regarding the sections (or fields) students choose for their M.A. or Ph.D. examinations. Properly planned and delivered it should include: advice on conference attendance, the writing of abstracts, the fine points of preparing a paper for a professional meeting or a journal, the preparation of *CV*s, the writing of letters of inquiry for employment, the preparation of dossiers, assistance with the planning and writing of dissertation chapters, and the preparation of the dissertation abstract. Teaching, mentoring, and advising are, or should be, closely linked activities.

Graduate programs should be conceived as a training ground for professionals. But such training should not be limited to traditional disciplinary coursework in either language or literature. As part of their professional preparation, and in order to meet the demands of the marketplace, students, particularly those in a Ph.D. program, should be trained in both the teaching of basic language and in the teaching of their subject matter—whether it be literature or linguistics. This can be accomplished by including two proseminars in the graduate curriculum:

1) A proseminar on basic language instruction in which students absorb the latest theories in foreign language instruction and second language acquisition. This course should be taught by an Applied Linguist, preferably the Director of Basic Language Instruction. In their basic language teaching assignments as Graduate Assistants, the graduate students should apply the materials learned in the proseminar under the supervision of the Director of Basic Language Instruction.

2) Proseminars on the teaching of literature and linguistics. These may be organized in many different ways. Ideally they should provide theoretical readings on the subject of how to teach literature or linguistics. But such courses should be both theoretical and practical; in addition to learning theory, students should have the opportunity, under the supervision of a faculty member, to teach a segment of an advanced class in their major discipline.

Meeting Today's Challenges. In administering graduate programs today departments might well wish to keep a number of issues in mind:

1) Teaching programs should not be permitted to atrophy because of their perpetuation without review. They should be subject to periodic evaluation in order to see whether they are effective and are in sync with evolving national standards and new areas of knowledge.
2) In reviewing programs, the voice of the graduate student body should not be marginalized. Students often have some very cogent and pertinent notions about their graduate education. They should be brought into the process of ongoing change.
3) One of the hallmarks of today's programs, in response to our rapidly changing educational environment and its restrictive fiscal picture, is flexibility. A quick glance at the *MLA Job Information List* today, compared with that of five years ago, will show some dramatic changes in what departments and programs need and demand. Programs must be responsive to these needs without surrendering standards of excellence in the preparation of the new generation of scholars. Two examples: a) There is a growing realization across the nation that the teaching of basic language courses must be in the hands of or supervised by faculty whose research centers on issues related to the teaching of foreign languages. Hence, the increase vacancies for entry level positions in applied linguistics and foreign language teaching methodology to oversee basic language instructional programs. This demand must be reflected in the preparation offered by foreign language departments across the country; b) Positions in literature are more often than not defined today in terms of narrower specializations than in previous years: the narrative, or Andean literature, or the contemporary short story. Combined with this focus is the insistence that applicants know contemporary literary theory and use it in effective, imaginative ways in their writing. Departments must respond to this change by modifying their curricular offerings, their syllabi, and, where applicable, introducing changes in the fields allowed for Ph.D. examinations. The theory dimension should not be handled simply by asking students to enroll in a theory course given in either the English or the Comparative Literature departments. Theory must be an integral part of foreign language departmental seminars and advanced courses so that students have a model constantly before them in order to absorb the use of theory as part of their reading and writing.

4) Students should be encouraged to take courses outside the foreign languages departments. Given the current state of cultural illiteracy which, unfortunately, reaches into the graduate student body, every inducement should be used to see to it that students broaden their horizons by studying other, related disciplines and/or literatures. They should also be encouraged to engage in interdisciplinary programs such as Italian Studies, Latin American Studies, Women's Studies, Latino Studies, etc. We need specialization as noted in point 3 above, but we also need students who finish their Ph.D. with a broad social, historical, and ideological perspective.

5) The need to instill a sense of professionalism. In recommending the introduction of proseminars we spoke above of the need to provide training that is not limited exclusively to coursework. A corollary to this statement, with regard to curricular matters, is to make certain, in devising new courses or revamping existing ones, they do not merely reflect changing knowledge in a particular discipline, but also focus on the development of professional aptitudes.

Conclusion. In administering graduate programs there have always been challenges. Today, as noted, they are aggravated by short budgets. The diminution in funding will undoubtedly affect quality. Without proper funding it is often difficult, if not impossible, to modify programs, consider new initiatives, hire senior faculty, provide graduate students with the proper library materials or the extra-classroom activities, such as guest lecturers who constitute an enriching element in graduate education. But, on the other hand, the realistic view of today's fiscal and intellectual challenges imposes the unavoidable task of rethinking program administration in order to deal with current problems. And, if we do so, without sacrificing standards of excellence, we will be able to move our teaching programs forward and redistribute our resources so as to continue offering our students a challenging educational experience.

NOTES

[1] The writer is aware of the alternatives for professional choice that students in foreign language programs have. However, most students who come into graduate programs in foreign language departments do so *without such alternative career choices in mind.* And still others drift into alternative careers only when driven to do so by the realities of a limited job market.

CHAPTER 6

Recruiting and Hiring Faculty

Edward J. Mullen
University of Missouri-Columbia

It is axiomatic that hiring and matters related to tenure and promotion in rank are probably two of the most significant decisions department chairs are involved in during their period of service. In the paragraphs below, I would like to outline some of the major issues involved in the recruitment and hiring of faculty, stressing those features that are not only unique to academics in general, but to foreign language professionals in particular. Although the goal of this essay is to offer practical information, I have occasionally incorporated into the text references to essays and booklets that I have found particularly useful for department chairs and, in particular, chairs who are new at their jobs.

While the role of the department chair is certainly central to the hiring process, it is important for the chairs to understand at the onset that hiring authority is typically not vested in the office of chair. At most colleges and universities, academic departments conduct their own recruitment and selection of faculty members under general guidelines furnished by members of the upper administration: the dean, the provost, the vice president for academic affairs, or others. Authority to select final candidates and extend official offers of employment is generally delegated to the chairs of the academic departments or the individual faculty members responsible for chairing search committees. Although varying degrees of consultation with the dean and provost may take place before the final offers are made, the dean, the provost, the chancellor, the president, and ultimately, the board of regents, governing board, or board of curators retains in theory the authority to veto these decisions. However, this event is probably extremely rare. The actual chain of command and vesting of hiring authority depend typically on institutional size and type. In smaller institutions, it may, in fact, be the president who has the final authority to tender an offer, while at larger universities, this responsibility is delegated to another member of the administration. Early on, the department chair should discuss with the academic dean issues related to hiring authority and try to get a clear picture of the various stages he or she must pass through to obtain approval; first to advertise for a position, and ultimately to tender a formal offer. There is no question, however, that in the past decade, the process of hiring has become more complex and more intricate; and all of these factors mean that effective department chairs need, above all, to be good managers and be aware of a number of details that will be dealt with in the following paragraphs.

A basic assumption (one often forgotten when discussing hiring) is that although the majority of the *obvious* work related to recruitment takes place in the early fall and during the interview period, there would be no recruiting whatsoever if departments, in tandem with their chairs, did not communicate effectively and early on the need for the position. As Robert Weisbuch wrote: "I learned by failure to do everything out of season—to start proposing positions in February, say, or to lobby for salary increases in October. I also learned to discuss everything during off-seasons—that is, to involve the administration in the ongoing life of the department. This approach means publicizing achievements, of course, but it also means total frankness about the problems."[1] The recruitment and hiring process, then, cannot be viewed as a discrete period from early fall until late spring, but it is an ongoing process that involves constant communication with many levels of the institution's administration, about the real needs to fill vacancies. Here, I would strongly suggest to chairs that if their departments are not already members they join the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, a membership which entitles them to a subscription to the *ADFL Bulletin*. This journal publishes essays dealing with professional, pedagogical, curricular, and departmental matters. In particular, the *Bulletin* reprints invaluable statistical information concerning enrollment patterns in post-secondary education, which are essential in the "convincing process." Armed with convincing data on enrollment patterns, teaching load policies, etc., a department chair is in far better position to secure approval to recruit at a timely point in the academic year. It should be remembered that even during the best of times, academic deans are constantly juggling priorities, and chairs who are able to present a case for a needed position, supported by reasonable data, are in a far better position to get what they need.

Once permission to recruit has been obtained from the proper administrative officer (in most cases, this would be the academic dean), I would strongly suggest the chair read the following: *A Career Guide for Ph.D.s and Ph.D. Candidates in English and Foreign Languages,* revised by English Showalter and published by the Modern Language Association.[2] This revised version of the *Guide for Job Candidates and Department Chairmen in English and Foreign Languages* (first published in 1973) represents the collective thinking of several generations of members of the MLA Committee on Careers of the Association of Departments of English (ADE) and the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL). This standard, indispensable guide is the booklet that respective candidates probably have already read. This will not only sensitize the chair to a number of important issues in academic hiring but also alert him/her to the expectations that prospective candidates will have already formed about what a job search *ought* to be like. Another useful article is Ann Bugliani's "Strategies for Successful Hiring."[3] This readable article by an experienced department chair who hired some 28 faculty members in a period of five years, is a must for anyone about to embark on a national search.

The next juncture in the hiring process is the appointment of a committee to oversee the initial selection process. At most schools, recruitment committees are not hiring committees, i.e., they don't hire the candidate; they assist the department in selecting the finalist for the job. While department chairs are not vested with hiring authority, they do have the authority to appoint committees, and a good recruitment committee is a key to a successful job search. Ideally, a committee should be appointed early in the process (late August is a good target date) in order that it might shape a draft description of the job, which will be later shared with the faculty. While there are no absolute rules, it seems to me that a three-person committee works well. In departments that consist of all modern languages or groups of related languages, it is also a good idea to include a member who does not teach the language of the person being sought. Once the committee has been appointed, the next stage involves the drafting of a job description.

When writing the job description, think of it as a newspaper story with the most important information coming first: rank, followed by level of job security, i.e., tenure track, non-regular, etc., followed by field specialization, followed by teaching expectations, followed by other useful qualifiers. I would suggest the advertisement end with a request for full dossiers, including letters of recommendation, and with the address of the person to whom the materials should be sent, preferably the department chair. Remember, in most institutions, the department chair *is* the department's affirmative action officer and to comply with necessary requirements and to see that papers are processed in an orderly manner, it is best to have them sent to the person charged with these responsibilities. I agree with Ann Bugliani that, although the MLA Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities discourages departments from asking for full dossiers, I have personally found it useful, at the initial screening stage, to have candidates present at least three letters of recommendation. The chair should see that the ad is clear, to-the-point, and that numerous qualifiers are avoided. I call this the "ice cream sundae syndrome," in which faculty members add on, willy-nilly, a host of personal interests and subtexts that clutter the ad and make it difficult for the reader to know for whom you are looking. Here, the department chair must exercise some firmness and remind his or her colleagues that there is a finite limit to what can be put in an ad and explain the real limitations of space. Truth in advertising ought to be your basic guide. Also set a realistic date by which you expect to receive inquiries and stick to it.

While there are a number of avenues for publishing job announcements, the standard is, no doubt, the *MLA Job Information List*, which is published by the Modern Language Association four times a year. Typically, materials are due at the MLA office in mid-September in order to appear in the October issue. Knowing this information in advance is crucial for a good search. Other sources often used are *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and on occasion, the professional journals of language-specific groups, e.g., *French Review, Hispania, German Quarterly*, etc.

The meeting at which the job description is defined is also an excellent opportunity to share with the faculty concerns about the initial screening process. Typically, this process is the responsibility of the committee, especially in a large department. If the department is smaller, the search committee may consist of the whole department serving as a committee of the whole. Even in large departments, an invitation to interested faculty to review letters of inquiry and make comments and suggestions to the recruitment committee is a healthy way of keeping lines of communication open and gleaning valuable information from colleagues who are technically not on the committee.

Once the job description has been drafted by the recruitment committee and reviewed by the department chair in order to see that it complies with certain institutional mandates, it should be shared with the faculty as a whole. My experience has been that most problems related to job searches, misunderstandings about whom the department wishes to hire, and the protocols the department wishes to use during the selection process start at this point. Here is the time for the chair to lay all cards on the table. Not only do the qualifications of the prospective candidate need to be discussed candidly and explained to the faculty, but the process itself needs to be reviewed. This is consensus-building time. It's the time when the chair outlines the procedures that are to take place, invites faculty participation, explains prior discussions with the dean concerning levels of salary and rank, and tries to ascertain honestly what the faculty want to do. This is also an excellent opportunity for the chair to review the institution's Affirmative Action policies and remind faculty of their responsibilities and obligations with reference to recruitment and hiring. The inside cover of the *MLA Job List* contains a list of do's and dont's for job interviews. While I would find it inappropriate to lecture the faculty, it's a good time to remind them how often innocent, sometimes even well-intentioned comments can be misinterpreted and damage the search process deeply or even irreparably. At the end of this meeting, the faculty should know what kind of candidate they are looking for, who will attend the MLA interview sessions, and, above all, whether the recruitment committee will have the authority to invite candidates to the campus or if this committee needs to bring back information to the department before tendering such invitations. Are special considerations for hiring minority candidates an issue in the department? If so, *say so.* If the department elects to conduct a pro-active, non-national search, in consultation with the upper administration, it should go ahead and do so. Placing ads that are fraudulent is an affront to the profession, accomplishes nothing, and breeds a quite justifiable cynicism.

After the advertisement is placed in the appropriate publication, inquiries will arrive at the department office. Receipt should be acknowledged by letter or postcard. Be aware that Affirmative Action procedures (in particular, see the section concerning the hiring of non-U.S. citizens) require the collection of certain statistical data. I have found the easiest way in the world of word-processing is to produce a standard letter addressed to the applicant, in which you acknowledge receipt of the dossier, note on the bottom of this letter if materials are missing, and describe the department's recruitment plans, i.e., when they are likely to select finalists for an initial screening interview. Here's where the department chair becomes manager. Remember, you will be responsible for reporting to the upper administration a great deal of information about your job search. If you fail to acknowledge the inquiries, fail to collect necessary data, your search may come to a screeching halt. When letters of inquiry and dossiers have been collected, the chair of the recruitment committee or department chair should notify faculty in order that they may begin to review dossiers before the final meeting to select candidates for the initial screening, typically at the MLA meetings held in late December. The recruitment committee has now screened the initial applicants (ideally with an invitation extended to all faculty who, although not voting on the issue, might supply expertise) and now is the time to pick the finalists. I would suggest that in order to conduct professional interviews in depth and not to exhaust the already worn-out recruitment committee, a *reasonable* number of candidates should be selected. The "interview-them-all" technique is bound to fail. The number, of course, will be related to the number of applications you have received. There is no secret number, although interviewing more than ten candidates seems a bit extreme. This is the last chance the chair has to see that the faculty are informed about the identity of the candidates to be interviewed. Files of finalists should be available in the departmental office for the review of the faculty, prior to any final meeting, so they may ask informed questions. This meeting is not a time to recite the *CV* of everyone who has applied or answer extraneous questions about their qualifications, but to explain why the finalists have been selected and to seek the faculty's approval and help.

Although there are no hard and fast rules about this next stage, many departments have chosen to conduct initial screening of candidates at the MLA's December meeting since it provides a common ground for prospective job applicants and employers to meet. Depending upon the finances of the institution involved, recruitment committees can vary from as few as one (a department chair) to typically three. A committee larger than three may become awkward. Personally, I find a two-person committee with a faculty member in reserve (in case of illness) to be the ideal. The finalists should be notified of their selection with sufficient time so they can make appropriate plans. Candidates who have not been selected for initial screening interviews should be so notified. I've also found from experience that calling a candidate to arrange an interview is an important step, since it allows the chair an opportunity to have an initial personal contact. In short, initial screening interviews should be scheduled for a reasonable length of time (thirty to forty minutes) with breaks scheduled in between to allow for candidates who are late. The interview team should rehearse a set of standard questions to ask each candidate, so they can be judged fairly. In our field, of course, a portion of the interview should be conducted in the target language. I've often found the most comfortable way to conduct this part of the interview is to ask the candidate to speak about research interests or teaching interests, or perhaps something in their dossier that strikes the interview team as particularly interesting. After having seen all candidates, the team needs to get together while their ideas are fresh and determine their finalists, which will then be shared, hopefully, with the department upon their return to campus.

After finalists have been selected, and presumably with the support and backing of the whole department, it is now time for the department chair to invite the candidates to campus. Here again, it's important to check with the dean or another academic officer to see if the institution needs further information prior to making this crucial offer. Typically, two to three candidates are brought to campus for this final narrowing of the selection process. It's best to put all arrangements for the campus interview into the hands of one person for obvious reasons. In most institutions, this is the responsibility of the chair. The recruitment committee, after all, has now finished most of its work, having narrowed down the field. I would suggest calling the finalists to see if they are, in fact, still interested in the job. Be forthright about salary expectations and expectations for rank and period of tenure review. These, after all, are your finalists, selected after a great deal of hard work, but there is certainly no point in inviting someone to campus who expects to be an associate professor when the dean has indicated the level of assistant professor to be the only rank for which you can recruit. This is the last chance to save time, money, and a great deal of frustration. If your candidates are all willing to come to campus, the next stage is clearly setting up a reasonable itinerary which allows them an opportunity to get to know not only the faculty, students, and administrators, but the community as well. Candidates should be sent a typed itinerary in advance, including their flight schedule, who is to meet them at the airport, pick them up from their hotel, and take them to various offices. The schedule offered candidates typically includes a number of fixed items: meetings with individual faculty members, the academic dean or chancellor, and the department chair; a presentation to the faculty and often an opportunity to teach a class in their field of specialization. Remember, candidates rarely forget campus visits, particularly bad ones. It's the chair's responsibility to organize a day or two in which candidates have an opportunity to show their best. This can hardly be accomplished if the campus interview is tantamount to a gauntlet, with the candidate dragged from office to office, with little opportunity to rest, or see and enjoy the campus. Give each candidate some completely free time.

After all candidates have visited the campus, the faculty need to meet quickly to select the finalist. Remember, if the department has done its homework well and selected the best, the candidate is likely to have other job offers. Here the department chair again can play a crucial role in guiding the department through the selection process in such a way as to maximize the experience and minimize the mistakes. In most institutions, selection of finalists is done by departmental vote which follows a discussion of the campus visit. I've always found it important to remind the faculty at the beginning of this meeting to avoid undue criticism and negative comments: they will come back to haunt you. I'm always reminded of a colleague who referred to one of our candidates as a "mindless grind." That "grind" then went on to get an appointment at a prestigious Ivy League school and ultimately to achieve tenure there. This is also the time for the department to decide in what priority it wishes to rank candidates. What happens if the first choice declines? Is the second choice acceptable? *Now is the time to decide*. The chair, after all, will need to tender an offer soon and will not have time to reconvene the department constantly as circumstances may change.

The last stage in the process of hiring is tendering a formal letter of offer to the candidate after he/she has had the customary campus visit. This is an important document, and in some cases, particularly those of non-U.S. citizens, it is crucial that certain details be reviewed. Since letters of offer cannot be tendered, typically, at most universities, without the written approval of the dean, the institution's Affirmative Action officer, and academic provost, the process can be somewhat protracted. Once your finalist has been selected by the department and you have received approval from the university official most likely to have hiring authority (translate: the academic dean), it's a good idea to call the candidate, explain that he/she has been selected as the department's choice and that a formal written offer can be expected within a reasonable period of time. Now is the chance to ask again if the person is still firmly interested in your university or if, in fact, there is a competing offer from another school. I generally explain to candidates that upon receipt of the formal letter of offer they will have a fixed period of time during which they must accept or decline the offer. This preliminary phone call is also an excellent opportunity to answer candidates' questions about such things as moving expenses or other details not made clear during the campus visit. If the candidate expresses continued interest and final approval arrives, the final stage is the drafting of the formal letter of offer. This document, since it represents a contract of sorts between the hirer and the institution, should be reviewed with great care—in most institutions, the academic dean will review your draft—and should contain all the essential information: rank to be offered, years towards tenure, teaching load, salary, and any other expectations that have been agreed upon between you and the prospective employee concerning his or her overall responsibilities at your school.

Mistakes made here will come back to haunt the department chair and the institution as the hour of tenure appears if things have been left muddled or unclear. Another important caveat: because a large number of hires in languages and literatures departments are not U.S. citizens, it is important that you review with appropriate administrative officers in the university any special wording required by your letter of offer. Remember: you may be hiring a recent graduate on a student visa or a faculty member who has had a visiting appointment or a number of other visa categories which allow for visiting scholars. In any case, every recruitment which encounters an applicant in this category should be referred to a designated individual within your university who has special expertise in dealing with non-citizens. Most foreign scholars whom departments recruit are keenly aware of what the immigration laws require of them. Bear in mind, the Immigration and Nationality Act provides distinct tests for job offers as college and university teachers. The statute permits the employer to reject applications for the job from qualified U.S. workers who are less qualified than the alien. However, the employer must show that the alien was selected for the job pursuant to a competitive recruitment and selection process through which he/she was found to be more qualified than any of the U.S. workers who applied for the job. All this goes to underscore the importance of conducting a job search rigorously. The department chair, no doubt, will be required to complete a number of documents detailing the process of the job search and supplying important statistical information.

The letter of offer should also contain wording to the effect that the job offer is contingent upon the candidate's obtaining a visa status which permits the university to hire him or her in the capacity for which he or she was hired and for the period of time specified in the letter of offer. My experience has been that non-U.S. citizens are generally well-informed about the process and are happy to cooperate in the completion of the paperwork, since it is in the best interests of both the candidate and the institution that things be done properly.

Even after the most carefully worded letter of offer has been sent and prior discussions have taken place, circumstances often change that require the department chair to respond to any number of candidates' queries. Listed below are a couple of typical scenarios, which many department chairs have encountered:

1) The candidate calls and requests an extension before accepting the offer in order to explore other possibilities.
2) The candidate announces that he/she is willing to accept the offer contingent upon employment responsibilities for a spouse or companion.[4]
3) The candidate returns the signed offer, and then announces he/she has accepted a position at another university, because of pressing personal circumstances.

The list, of course, can go on. Clearly, no essay can offer answers to complicated and often last-minute changes in circumstances. The one thing department chairs ought to do is seek counsel from their department colleagues. If you are required to make an immediate response, perhaps the recruitment committee ought to be the first group to approach with your dilemma. If time allows, a meeting of the whole faculty might be appropriate. At any rate, all of these unforeseen circumstances place the department chair in the classic dilemma inherent in the position itself: the hydra head of responsibility on the one hand, and lack of authority on the other. If, however, the department has done its homework: advertised properly, screened candidates well, offered potential employees a rewarding campus experience, and developed a list by consensus of alternate candidates, many of these problems can be solved.

Common sense and honesty are probably the two elements which ultimately have to be put in place when last-minute decisions are required. And if all else fails and the department is unable to locate a qualified candidate, it is always best to agree to start over again. In most cases, this option will require a limited search for a one-year replacement. Even though it is frustrating to admit to a failed search and the temptation to hire any warm body is very real, in the long run it simply isn't worth it. In summary, good searches need to be well-managed. Even in the most congenial departments, those with the most hard-working and fair-minded faculty, it will, after all, be the chair himself or herself who must assume responsibility for the organizational aspects of a good search—which, when well-handled, has a good chance of being a successful one.

NOTES

[1] Robert Weisbuch, "Recruiting in Ignorance," *Profession 91* (1991): 53-55.

[2] *A Career Guide for Ph.D.s and Ph.D. Candidates in English and Foreign Languages*, revised by English Showalter, New York: MLA, 1985.

[3] Ann Bugliani, "Strategies for Successful Hiring," *ADFL Bulletin* 23.2 (1992): 26-28.

[4] This issue is a timely one, but cannot be fully treated in this essay. I would suggest the following essay: Mary Burgan et al., "Two Careers, One Relationship: An Interim Report on 'Spousal' Hiring and Retention in English Departments," *Profession 91* (1991): 56-62. See also Chapter 17 of the present volume.

CHAPTER 7

Evaluating Faculty

J. Christopher Eustis
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Faculty evaluation is one of the key factors determining the health and happiness of an academic department. Indeed, it is essential for the smooth administrative functioning and collegial interaction of a department that there be clear, consistent, and equitable published guidelines which faculty members can rely on to provide them with the standards and procedures by which they will be evaluated. From the point of view of those charged with carrying out faculty evaluation, too, such guidelines are an indispensable reminder of the department's commonly held values and expectations for all of its faculty as well as a means of facilitating and ensuring uniformity in the evaluation process.

For all regular faculty, annual merit reviews are the basis for salary adjustments which reflect the assessment of one's professional performance. For tenure-track junior faculty, evaluation is the North Star by which untenured professors should be able to judge with certainty if they are on course toward earning tenure and promotion. Tenured senior faculty at the associate rank depend on evaluation for promotion to full, and for faculty at the rank of full professor there may be the opportunity for advancement to a chaired or distinguished professorship. In the case of non-tenure track temporary and part-time faculty members, reappointment or the ability to get other jobs may well depend on thorough, regular appraisals of their professional activity. Some sort of evaluation generally also must support the nomination of faculty members at all ranks for teaching, research, or service awards.

Whatever the rank or nature of the appointment, faculty evaluation is perhaps the most delicate and potentially most problematic personnel exercise in which academic departments should without exception engage on a regular basis. When done well, evaluation can be a powerful force in fostering faculty development. If done in a slipshod, unfair, or even captious manner, evaluation can have far-reaching negative consequences, not only for the individual who is the victim of such action, but also for the department as a whole, for the college within a university, and even for an entire institution. As well as being potentially ruinous to an individual's career, unjust or capricious evaluation is likely to cause low departmental morale, disgruntlement, disunity, rancor, and resentment, not to speak of possible legal ramifications.

Careless or arbitrary evaluation may well compromise a department's ability to obtain support within the college or university, to recruit and retain faculty and graduate students, to have its faculty members selected to serve on committees, or to hold professional offices. Above all, evaluation has a direct bearing on faculty members' livelihood, likelihood of success or failure, self-esteem, and attitude toward their colleagues, their department, their institution, and the profession itself. An appreciation of the issues involved in evaluating faculty, therefore, is a *sine qua non* not only for effective departmental leadership, but also for the preservation of collegial relations among department members, and ultimately for the maintenance of a strong overall academic culture.

A broad discussion of faculty evaluation cannot account for all of the different approaches to this activity taken by departments according to varying size, composition, and mission. There are, nonetheless, certain basic considerations upon which any system of evaluation should be built, several nearly universal professional decision points where evaluation is of crucial importance, and a number of general policies and procedures which should apply in most instances, regardless of the character of an institution or department. One might expect the following fundamental questions to underlie any set of guidelines for evaluation:

1) Why conduct evaluation?
2) Who should be evaluated?
3) What should be evaluated?
4) How, when, and how often?

5) What are the criteria and procedures in each case?
6) Who evaluates and how is he or she selected?
7) How are evaluations used?
8) What safeguards are built in to ensure due process?

The answer to the first question, "Why conduct evaluation," will seem glaringly obvious. Faculty evaluation is required so that informed, reasoned, and defensible decisions can be made about raises; reappointment, tenure, promotion, and other kinds of recompense a department or institution may offer its members. Another way of saying the same thing is that evaluation is a means whereby departments seek to maintain standards by smiling on those who perform satisfactorily and by frowning on and weeding out if possible those who fail to meet performance expectations. In this regard, reviews of faculty achievement can be seen both as an incentive and as a threat intended to motivate professors to measure up to the norms established by the department or to pay the consequences. If evaluation is viewed or practiced principally as an admonitory or punitive device, however, its primary, most important function will be diminished if not thwarted altogether. Except in intractable cases and lost causes, when evaluation can result only in justifiable negative action, even in identifying problem areas the role of evaluation should not be to disparage and discourage faculty members, but rather to encourage them and to suggest ways in which improvement can be made. In other words, evaluation is most effective when it acts as a means of mentoring and serves the ends of faculty development at all stages of a professor's career.

The remaining questions posed above can be discussed largely in the context of the various major judgmental junctures at which evaluation comes into play in most academic departments. These decisive moments are:

1) Merit raise reviews
2) Periodic probationary reviews
3) Mandatory tenure and promotion reviews
4) Promotion reviews separate from tenure decisions
5) Evaluation for retention of non-tenure-track faculty

In cases where a merit system is used, the actual evaluation procedures employed are likely to vary greatly. In general, nonetheless, all regular faculty members must be reviewed annually for the purpose of salary adjustment decisions. Such reviews should take cognizance primarily of the three basic areas of professional competence: teaching, research, and service. Collegiality, too, is an important consideration, although this facet of professional life is somewhat less tangible than the other three and can be harder to define, measure, and agree upon. Of course, the weight assigned to each area will vary according to the priorities of a given department. In some cases, for example, research and publication in the traditional sense may not be a departmental requirement. So too, within a department variable weights may be attached to the different areas on an individual basis, either permanently or temporarily, by mutual agreement between the chair and each faculty member. Assuming that merit adjustments will be based on evaluation, there must be an unambiguous understanding of what areas of one's professional competence are to be evaluated and what criteria are to be applied.

In evaluating teaching, it is vital that multiple measures of pedagogical effectiveness be taken into account.[1] These should include consideration of student numerical evaluations and written comments; peer evaluations; teaching materials, i.e., syllabi, copies of handouts, worksheets, tests; and possibly also copies of student work with evidence of sound grading practices and of thorough correcting and guidance. Evidence of the successful use of imaginative techniques of innovation and of creative course development might be considered as well. Perhaps a teaching dossier with statements of the faculty member's philosophy, objectives, methodology, and goals might be required or encouraged. In all cases, evidence of improvement should be acknowledged and rewarded. Advising effectiveness, too, may be viewed as an extension of the teaching mission and can be assessed through surveys to ascertain student satisfaction much the same way as student perceptions of classroom performance are obtained.

The obvious ground rules for equitable, constructive evaluation of teaching include the use of a standardized form for student perceptions. The way in which the responses to such a form are interpreted, especially numerical scores, must be consistent as well and must correspond to agreed upon departmental definitions of what a given number on a particular scale is understood to mean. Likewise, the rules for administering student evaluations must be the same for all members or for different groups within a department such as untenured versus tenured professors, including the number and range of classes which must be evaluated, the period during which evaluations are conducted, the amount of time students are given to complete the forms, the absence of the professor from the classroom while students are writing their evaluations, the prohibition on faculty members' seeing their evaluations until after the final grades have been handed in, and so forth.

Classroom peer visitation requires especially well thought out and sensitive procedures. Here, too, a written guide for reviewers directing them to pay particular attention to certain areas of teaching competence or standards for performance is extremely important for the sake of fairness and consistency. Equally indispensable are safeguards to protect faculty members against biased or mistaken characterizations of what occurred in the classroom. Whether it be a sole class visited by a single evaluator, or one or more classes observed by a pair of evaluators each of whom does a separate evaluation, or a team which visits several classes in succession and writes a joint summary, any peer evaluation arrangement must allow the person being evaluated the opportunity to put the day's activity into perspective by talking with the evaluator beforehand, providing a copy of the syllabus, explaining what the class has been doing and what the objectives of the day are, etc. Similarly, after the class visit the evaluator's impressions must be shared with the faculty member in a timely manner, no more than a day or two later, and the sooner the better. It is also desirable that this communication first be done verbally and then in a tentative written form after which more discussion should take place if the person evaluated feels it necessary. It also should be the right of faculty members to request another evaluation in the event that they might feel that the first class observed was not representative owing to demonstrable extenuating circumstances. Only once these steps have been taken should the letter be submitted for the permanent record, and the person evaluated should receive a copy of the letter as well. Finally, if convinced that justice has not been done, the faculty member who has been evaluated should be able to express honest disagreement through a verbal hearing or written rebuttal or both, which will be given due consideration and also be incorporated into the official proceedings. If it is the practice of a department to include all peer evaluation letters in tenure and promotion dossiers, then it should be the prerogative of the chair and the departmental personnel committee to exercise their judgment in possibly eliminating any flagrantly unfair, prejudicial letters from a colleague's file.

Scholarship in the traditional sense of published work and conference presentations, etc., as opposed to the broader definition Ernest Boyer has proposed,[2] must be evaluated according to established local standards regarding both quantity and quality. Such an undertaking requires careful reading, some knowledge about the outlets in which published material appears and about the meetings where papers are presented, and an ability to judge the work's depth, breadth, polish, originality, and significance. To be sure, this may be a tall order for an evaluation committee much less for a chair alone, but the job must be done to the best of the evaluators' ability. For merit reviews in some departments it is left entirely up to the chair to make these judgments, while in other instances the chair may have the benefit of a committee recommendation. In any event, as with the evaluation of teaching, some sort of scale may be used to gauge and rank a faculty member's scholarly accomplishments on an annual basis. One approach is to assign to each kind of research activity varying numerical values which attempt to account as well for quality: twenty to thirty points for an original critical book-length study, five to ten points for a journal article, three to five points for a conference paper, or whatever. According to the total number of points earned, the individual then can be located on a more general scale of productivity and quality, divided, let us say, into the categories "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor." It really does not matter what scale is used as long as the process of evaluation is not entirely subjective or whimsical and provided the scale has been ratified by departmental consensus and is applied to all equally. In the final analysis, however, the determination of quality may be resistant or even downright inimical to any numerical categorization or scale, and thus may have to rest largely on an evaluator's experienced professional judgment.

Service also often is difficult to assess in terms of quality. Unless committee chairs are asked for written appraisals or unless an accounting of time spent and detailed individual descriptions of service contributions and accomplishments are required, evaluation of service perforce will rely largely on quantitative measurement. Still, different kinds of service involvement legitimately can be accorded greater or lesser value, and certain assumptions can be made concerning service on one committee versus another. While what counts as service will vary widely from case to case, here, too, a flexible numerical system may be worked out to give a fair reckoning of each faculty member's activities. As always, what is essential is that the system be known and be acceptable to the department as a whole.

Turning lastly to the penumbrous region of collegiality, there is little advice that can be given except a reminder that hearsay, unfounded allegations, individual dislikes based on personality differences which a faculty member being evaluated may be unaware of and have done nothing to provoke are not valid professional grounds for impugning an individual's cooperative spirit. If collegiality is called into question, it must be on the basis of concrete instances of uncooperativeness, discourtesy, abusiveness, and like actions which general agreement holds to be uncollegial in nature. Although there is no scale to be applied here, such behavior can and should figure prominently in general faculty evaluation.

The procedure followed in communicating to faculty members their annual merit assessment and salary increment recommendation also can make a significant difference insofar as faculty morale and the atmosphere of a department are concerned. An open, consultative system is likely to inspire more confidence on the part of faculty members in the system and in the decisions reached about their performance than a closed, secretive, unappealable procedure. It is advisable, therefore, for a chair to give faculty members an opportunity to discuss their evaluation in person. Individual conferences held after a preliminary written appraisal has been provided permit possible clarification of unclear issues, reconciliation of points of disagreement, and revision if the chair so chooses, before the evaluation goes to the dean in its definitive form. Just as with peer evaluation letters, the faculty member ultimately also must have the right to contest formally the final report.

Especially in the case of medium-sized to large departments, if the annual merit raise review of all faculty is conducted solely by the chair, separately from a committee-based promotion and tenure review, it is implausible to expect the chair's recommendations for salary adjustments to be based on such exhaustive assessment of teaching, research, and service as has been suggested above. For that matter, often the complete records of tenured senior faculty are not subjected to scrutiny at all except once or twice for consideration for promotion. When it comes to periodic tenure and promotion review of junior faculty, however, it is imperative that the most thorough evaluations possible be carried out at reasonably spaced regular intervals.

Periodic review of progress toward tenure and promotion normally involves only tenure-track junior faculty over the course of a five-year probationary period, in accordance with AAUP guidelines. Some institutions conduct periodic full review of senior faculty as well, in which case slightly different procedures may be applied. In any event, the schedule adhered to by departments varies as much as other governance procedures for, and may be dictated by, institutional policy on how contracts are offered. Thus some departments conduct a complete evaluation every year, others only every two years (second and fourth), and others in the third and fifth years, prior to the mandatory tenure review in the fall of the sixth year. Whatever the schedule, full evaluation must take place often enough to give untenured professors an accurate idea of whether they are making the grade, and where improvement may be needed, so as to avoid at all costs a "sixth-year surprise." It is unconscionable to allow a faculty member to believe that all is well and then disclose at the last minute that performance has been inadequate. For this reason comprehensive evaluation of junior faculty must be frequent and consistent, so that a pattern of progress or the lack of it will be apparent and well documented. In addition, it cannot be emphasized enough that these reviews have to be entirely forthright, pointing out in no uncertain terms any serious deficiencies and offering constructive advice and guidance. Perhaps the most difficult task a chair has lies in striking the delicate balance between prodding and praising, never equivocating where hard truths must be told, but always attempting to encourage and acknowledge accomplishments, giving due recognition without either inflating or deflating out of proportion.

The same areas of faculty activity and the same procedural concerns apply for annual probationary period reviews as for separate merit reviews. However, while a chair alone may be responsible for merit (salary adjustment) decisions, if possible, an advisory committee should be used for the periodic evaluations of untenured faculty. Opinions vary on what the composition of such a committee should be, but it is common for only tenured, senior faculty members to be eligible for this duty, so as to avoid any potential conflict of interest between competing junior faculty members. Likewise, the committee may be entirely elected or partly appointed by the chair or head, or it simply might include all of the senior faculty members of a department. Sometimes overlooked, however, is the importance of also empowering the chair and the committee to call on other senior members of the department and perhaps even on persons from other departments within their institution, for additional, more authoritative opinions if it is felt that greater expertise is needed in judging an individual's scholarship.

Once the chair and the personnel committee have concluded their deliberations, proper, timely notification must be given to the junior faculty members under review. As always, the chair should convey the departmental perception to each untenured department member in writing, but as has been suggested before it is useful to hold a personal conference, perhaps with the entire committee, certainly with the chair or head individually, before the letter goes into the file. Furthermore, in many programs the second and fourth year reviews, or it may be the third and fifth years, are especially important, for at these points individuals whose performance clearly is unsatisfactory in one or more critical areas— normally teaching and research—may be told that their contract is not going to be renewed. Wherever the problem may lie, when no amount of mentoring seems to help and a faculty member appears incapable of meeting departmental standards, it is neither in the individual's nor in the department's best interest to prolong the decision to terminate a contract beyond the point at which the need for this action has become obvious. Such decisions can be very hard, but they must be made and must rest on a history of thorough evaluations. It is a professional obligation as well as a humane requirement to take such measures when they plainly are called for.

The most stressful and emotionally charged period in the professional life of many faculty members is the time of the mandatory tenure and promotion review. At this milestone all of the elements that figure in merit and annual probationary reviews come into play in a definitive, culminating fashion. Here, however, many departments, and especially those which emphasize research and publication, will want to seek authoritative outside opinions on a candidate's scholarship. Such outside evaluations can be extremely useful, since they lend greater objectivity and a broader focus than may be possible from within a department alone. Of course, the whole process can be of little value if the outside referees are not chosen with care, with attention to their own credentials and area of expertise, so as to get the best possible match. Also essential is to ask them to do only what they properly can do, which is to evaluate the quality of the research from the point of view of their sense of the standards of the discipline, or better yet their sense of what constitutes good work. So too, they should be given a clear idea of the expectations of the candidate's own department, some general information about the candidate (a *CV* should be sufficient), and a profile of the department (programs, size, teaching load, etc.). As a rule, outside referees are asked to comment only on the quality of the candidate's work, not on the quantity. Nor are they asked to suggest what the individual's chances of earning tenure or promotion would be at the reviewer's institution. Needless to say, the outside referees must be provided with copies of the candidate's work, or with a manageable, representative sampling, and they must be given sufficient time to read the material and to reach their conclusions. In selecting outside reviewers, the faculty member under review may be asked to submit a short list of names of possible reviewers. The candidate also may be permitted to name, within reason, any persons whom they prefer not be asked to evaluate their work. The chair characteristically will ask senior members of the department for recommendations as well, and it is advisable to contact chairs and senior faculty members at other institutions for further suggestions in arriving at a list of some seven to ten possible referees. Assuming that from three to six outside letters will be sought, the chair then most expeditiously can make first contact with the reviewers by phone, in priority order, until the required number of commitments has been obtained. For the sake of objectivity and to avoid possible personal complications, it would seem advisable that the candidate never be made responsible for contacting or be told the identity of the outside reviewers. Once the tenure and promotion proceedings have been concluded, it is a small courtesy for the chair to send the reviewers a brief letter of thanks together with an indication of how matters turned out. Whether or not an honorarium is offered to outside reviewers seems to be a policy that varies greatly from department to department.[3] Likewise, the weight given to outside letters must be a decision which also rests with the department and college or institution.

Non-tenure track full-time and part-time faculty should be accorded the same professional consideration as regular faculty insofar as evaluation is concerned. To be sure, it ought not to be necessary in these cases to engage in such comprehensive reviews as for tenure-track professors—research seldom is a requirement of non-tenure track appointments—but the interests of both the department and of temporary faculty require the protection and potential benefits afforded by systematic evaluation.

Ultimately, of course, evaluation of faculty at all ranks is of vital interest to an academic department not only because of the constructive, mentoring function, but also as a safeguard of the right of a department to exercise judgment in upholding its standards. In these litigious times no department can afford not to have in place and not to adhere scrupulously to a set of formal, fair procedures for evaluation. While the courts have been disinclined to question the professional judgment of individuals and committees making retention and promotion and tenure decisions, they have ruled in favor of plaintiffs where irregularities have occurred and when stated procedures have not been followed to the letter.[4] Of course, a satisfactory set of guidelines for evaluation, if followed, should preclude the possibility of discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or religion in matters of employment, but every chair must be constantly vigilant in this regard. Also important for chairs to keep in mind and to impress on the members of evaluation committees is the issue of disclosure. It is entirely possible in a legal challenge to an evaluation decision for the members of a promotion and tenure committee to be required to reveal how they voted. Departments should be prepared as well to provide candidates with concrete, defensible reasons for negative decisions, if indeed it already is not routine practice to do so. Similarly, one additional salient legal consideration pertinent to faculty evaluation is the question of right of access. Just as disclosure of votes may be mandated by the court, so, too, the complete records of promotion and tenure proceedings may be subject to subpoena. Although this remains a somewhat hazy issue, good sense, not to speak of fair play, suggests that one should be prepared to produce the evidence, under the assumption that all evaluation materials can become the object of legal scrutiny. Once again, the bottom line to which we return is that if evaluation is carried out equitably and consistently a department should have no cause to fear legal action.

When all is said and done, faculty evaluation really begins at the time of the job announcement for a vacant position and then continues through the entire screening and selection process. What follows once an appointment has been made is a continuation of the process which had as its underlying assumption the identification of a colleague who would be able to fulfill the terms and expectations of the position made clear from the very start. Faculty evaluation is no less than the fundamental building block of the profession, and if the departmental edifice is to be sturdy, then the procedures and practice of evaluation must themselves be rock solid.

NOTES

[1] Donald K. Jarvis, *Junior Faculty Development: A Handbook*, Ch. 3, "Evaluation and Reward Methods," (New York: MLA, 1991).

[2] Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

[3] At the time of writing this essay, the Modern Language Association has under way a survey to determine current attitudes and practices regarding the use of outside referees in tenure and promotion cases. In addition, the following statement was published in the *ADFL Bulletin* 23.3 (Spring 1992): 3.

> "Statement on the Use of Outside Reviewers"
>
> More and more, English and foreign language departments seek reviewers from outside the department to evaluate candidates for promotion or tenure, sometimes because of departmental policy but often because of a college or university requirement. Whether or not one approves, this practice has become common enough to create problems for those who are frequently asked for evaluations. Because the work of young scholars, even when published, is not likely to be widely circulated, reviewers must often read hundreds of pages of published and unpublished material before they can complete an evaluation. They are generally asked to perform this service on short notice and without compensation.
>
> When a department wishes, or is required, to obtain outside evaluations for personnel decisions, the ADE and the ADFL make the following recommendations:

a. Institutions should avoid inflexible rules specifying an invariable, and sometimes inordinately large, number of evaluations: in most instances two to four will suffice.

b. Institutions, following the practice of enlightened university presses and publishing houses, should offer reviewers adequate compensation and sufficient time to prepare reviews.

[4] This very sketchy discussion of the legal issues involved in faculty evaluation is indebted largely to an essay entitled "Court Challenges to Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Decisions," by Peter Seldin, published in September, 1984, as Idea Paper No. 12, by the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University. Professor Seldin's essay is itself adapted from his book, *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation*, published in the same year by Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA. Two other sources of information on this subject, also included in Seldin's list of references, are P. M. Balch, *Faculty Evaluation in Higher Education: A Review of Court Cases and Implications for the 1980s*, Washington, D.C: Educational Resources Information Center, U.S. Department of Education, 1980; and W. A. Kaplin, *The Law of Higher Education: Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

CHAPTER 8

Motivating Faculty Performance and Encouraging Scholarship

James A. Parr
University of California, Riverside

What follows is based on personal experience, on observation, and on a middling acquaintance with human nature. Actual experience includes six years as chair of modern foreign languages at Murray State University (1964-70) and four and one-half as chair of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Southern California (1978-82). The oddly configured term at USC comes from taking on the position midway through the term of a colleague who was obliged to step down for reasons better left unstated.

If that last remark adds a note of mystery, it serves my purpose well, for the first point I would make is that, as a leader, you must never reveal everything you know. The misguided egalitarian impulse that tends to overcome us all in moments of weakness must be resisted. Those of us born and bred in the USA, in particular, possess a natural but disconcerting ingenuousness that impels us to reveal more than is necessary, whether it concerns travel funds, monies for student help, or what was said in merit recommendations. But, clearly, to do so diminishes power and control; and without a modicum of power and control, it will be more difficult to motivate performance. Understand that I do not advocate playing the cards so close to the vest that no one else is privy to any information whatsoever; nor am I promoting enlightened despotism. Moderation in all things is still a good adage. What I want to convey is the simple fact that a bit of mystery about certain things confers an aura of privileged insight and, hence, authority.

Machiavelli was not entirely right when he assumed that men are naturally evil and must be governed accordingly. A more moderate assessment would point out, however, that all of us have as great a potential for evil as for good. I shall never forget a comment by one of my more worldly-wise colleagues when I assumed direction of the department at USC. He told me on the first day that I would not last—not because I was unfit in any of the more usual ways, but, as he quaintly put it, because I did not understand evil. At the time, I was blissfully unaware of the import of the remark and was uncertain whether it was a left-handed compliment or a recognition of my having lived a sheltered life. Somehow I did survive that half term and a three-year extension, but ultimately I was done in by the machinations of two individuals who executed well-timed end runs (sports metaphors are *de rigueur* in academic writing nowadays, thanks to Stanley Fish) in order to seduce two deans who were major players in the scheme of things. Suffice it to say that one of those colleagues had occupied the chair at some time prior to my own tenure, while the other assumed the position sometime after me. How do you prevent end runs of that sort, and how do you deal with hypocrisy and ingratitude? One could spend the better part of a career seeking answers to those imponderables.

The anecdote is intended to certify war wounds, on one hand, but more importantly, to lead to the next point about a kind of diffuse "evil" to which all of us sometimes fall prey. I think it behooves a chair of a department to try to *bring out the best* but always to *expect the worst* in human behavior. In that way, you are not disillusioned and, moreover, forewarned *is* forearmed. We are dealing, obviously, with peers who are gifted intellectually and who are capable of important contributions to the local and larger academic communities but also, at times, of considerable deviousness and even destructiveness.

The question is, then, how to encourage the positive contributions and discourage or diminish negativities. There is no one simple answer, but there are strategies that can be effective in most cases. First and foremost, it is essential that the faculty member, senior or junior, feel appreciated and important. There used to be an advice column in which the writer made a great point of urging that you picture each person with whom you come in contact wearing, prominently displayed, a badge or button saying "I want to feel important." And the follow-up point was that you should find a way to indulge them in that very human need.

How do you do that? Well, not by divulging all information to which you are privy, but rather by elementary kindness and courtesy. Simply greeting people and inquiring how their weekend went, how their spouse or children are, even whether the weather is to their liking, make them feel that you value them, their lives, and their opinions. And you must validate them if you want them to validate you. It does not seem at all unreasonable to say that if you are not a people person you will never be as effective a chairperson as you could be.

In my estimation, the very best move you can make in showing care and concern for faculty is to take each member of the department to lunch, individually, at least once a year: Ordinarily, there are some discretionary funds to cover this sort of morale building, but, if not, it is a good investment even if it has to come out of pocket. I have learned more from and about individual colleagues over lunch, sometimes with the aid of a glass of wine, than on any other business or social occasion.

It is important that people be involved in the functioning of the department on committees that relate to their interests. A great deal of care should be taken in committee assignments, and one way to be informed of those interests, and sometimes hidden talents, is to have sounded them out ahead of time over lunch.

Another strategy—although I hesitate to assign it such a manipulative name, for it simply involves caring and concern—is to see that everyone's reasonable needs are addressed. Does someone need a more powerful desk light? A new element for a typewriter? An upgrade for a computer? Some student assistance? Get on it immediately! Little nuisances and irritations impinge on morale, and low morale lowers productivity. How do you know whether such things are needed? You poke your head through doorways periodically and ask "Is there anything you need? Is there anything I can do for you ?" Department meetings are not the appropriate forum for such inquiries. They need to be personalized.

While it is probably self-evident that one leads best by example, the point bears repetition. If the chair is active in professional organizations on the local, regional, national, and international levels, others may be inspired to follow suit. If the chair publishes in leading journals and with major presses, colleagues will take note and likely set their sights at similarly high levels.

Among the rapidly diminishing perquisites of the profession are travel funds. A concerted effort needs to be made, perhaps in an alliance with other chairs, or through the good offices of the faculty senate, to preserve as large a pool of funds as possible for this purpose. Although one school of thought has it that faculty should hole up at home or in the library, produce their articles, and send them directly to journals, my experience has been that it is always preferable to present them as papers before seeing them set in cold, hard, unchangeable type. In order to do that, travel funds must be available. At least one professional meeting each academic year should be funded for every faculty member. If the divisional or college dean has no designated or discretionary monies, sometimes other sources can be tapped, possibly the graduate school or programs abroad, or, extramurally, maybe a consul general, a foundation, a corporation, or a wealthy patron in the community. Ideally, every department should have a Maecenas.

What of those who stop publishing? Here again, you must know your colleagues well as individuals. It may be that a situation has arisen that interferes with concentration. Perhaps the person needs to talk about it. Make yourself available—wherever you will both feel at ease: over lunch, over a drink after work, or in one of your offices. Considerable tact and discretion are required, obviously, and mutual trust is essential.

Naturally, there are those who were never meant to be on the cutting edge of the discipline, but they may be excellent classroom teachers, particularly on the undergraduate level. Assuming that local policies permit, the most humane approach is to negotiate a performance profile with each faculty member—not just the ones who publish less—so that everyone knows exactly what relative weight will be assigned in merit evaluations to the three major areas of endeavor: research, teaching, and service.

A standard profile might show 40% of total effort channeled into research, 40% toward teaching, and 20% for service of all kinds. But other arrangements should be possible, taking into account the overall mission of the department, the talents and present inclinations of the individual, the current status of research in progress, and other variables. Someone could well have a 60%-30%-10% profile (with research, teaching, and service in that order). Another, less inclined toward contributions to scholarship, might show a 20%-50%-30% configuration.

In each instance, the person is assessed annually on the basis of how well the "contract" has been fulfilled.

The profile itself should be reviewed by both parties at least every three years, but preferably every two. The objective, always, is fairness toward faculty, by allowing them to contract for certain kinds of anticipated performance, then rewarding them based upon fulfillment of those mutually agreed upon criteria.

A point to be made, but best not belabored, is that different expectations will reasonably exist within a doctoral program from those in a four-year liberal arts college. Doctoral programs are housed in research-oriented institutions, and it is therefore not unreasonable to expect everyone involved in those programs to show a profile designed to enhance extramural visibility. It is not in the interest of those involved, or of the discipline at large, to demand similar scholarly productivity of those who are obliged to assume more demanding teaching and service assignments.

Another potentially rewarding strategy for encouraging scholarship is the mentor system. The way I have implemented it is more or less as follows. When a junior faculty member is hired, you determine which senior member's field or critical orientation most closely coincides with those of the new hire. Very likely, some contact has already been established between the new person and one or more established members of the department. After sounding out the junior faculty member to see with whom that person might find it profitable to work, you then approach the senior person to ask whether a mentoring arrangement would be acceptable and fulfilling.

As always, a certain amount of tact and sensitivity is called for on your part. Also, please note that the alignment can conceivably be effected along one of two axes, either the specialty or the preferred critical approach. Sometimes critical approach may be the predominant consideration. Even though both persons may specialize in, say, nineteenth-century literature, the pairing of a neo-Marxist with a dyed in the wool Formalist is likely to be more productive of tension than tenure.

The objective of such an arrangement is probably apparent. The senior person can draw upon years of experience and, presumably, numerous contacts in order to offer advice on submissions—to conferences, journals, and presses—and should be able thereby to ease the transition from term paper and dissertation writing to full-fledged article and book preparation. It is also likely that the mentor can use those accumulated contacts to help place the mentee on conference programs at various levels.

Obviously, there needs to be good rapport between the two persons involved in the mentor/mentee relationship. The mentor must have confidence in the mentee in order to offer meaningful support extramurally. And the junior person must respect the judgment—and the scholarship—of the mentor. It is a potentially troublesome relationship that bears frequent monitoring by the chair. It is also one that can lend itself to abuse by the mentor, but, on balance, its positive potential outweighs the more obvious problems that can arise. If the chair stays alert to the dynamics of each such assignment, it should be possible to foresee and forestall any problems of consequence.

Needless to say, the chair should also do a considerable amount of informal mentoring of both junior *and* senior colleagues. The chair can also play a very constructive role in motivating performance by nominating colleagues for any number of awards, both for teaching and research, both intramurally and extramurally. It is also a valuable and generally appreciated service to call to everyone's attention published deadlines for submission of papers to various conferences and for soliciting internal and external grants. You may also be in a position to nominate colleagues for membership on advisory boards, such as your state Council on the Humanities. All of these overtures can increase morale by making colleagues feel appreciated, and they can lead to renewed dedication and heightened productivity, to say nothing of the gratitude and loyalty that may accrue to you as a byproduct.

One area in which the chair can take an initiative is in organizing monthly brown-bag—which is to say "noon-time"—seminars in which faculty present to their colleagues and any other interested parties, like graduate students or advanced undergraduates, the preliminary fruits of work in progress. Such occasions offer an opportunity for airing ideas in-house, in a relatively friendly environment, prior to setting them forth in more formal circumstances at a professional meeting, or in print. It may be possible to attract a receptive and reasonably critical audience by offering one unit of credit to those students who attend and participate by asking intelligent questions.

Different academic environments will naturally call for differing approaches. If you serve under a strong dean, you will face one set of problems; a strong senate, on the other hand, may call for different tactics; a strong faculty union, for yet other ways of coping. In every case, it is a matter of testing the waters, finding out what is possible and what is not, discovering how much relative authority you have in the circumstance in which you find yourself and, consequently, how you can best respond to the need to motivate faculty performance and encourage scholarship. If you have been named head of department, you should have more freedom and leeway than if you are chair, but, again, local variables and faculty governance statutes must always be taken into account.

Two terms as president of an AAUP chapter convinced me of the value of committees and strong committee chairs and, also, impressed upon me the importance of running a meeting according to parliamentary procedure. Too often, department meetings degenerate into group therapy sessions, as we are all painfully aware. It is therefore important that they be structured and businesslike, and it is clear that this will not be the case unless considerable planning is invested. My strategy would be to appoint standing committees at the beginning of the school year (for instance, library acquisitions, graduate studies, undergraduate studies, curriculum, lecture series, language program, etc.), making sure that each has a strong chair who will in fact call committee meetings or at least sound out the other members. Then you devote at least 90% of the time of each regular meeting (usually monthly) to hearing, discussing, and accepting reports from the chairs of each standing committee. You naturally serve as chair of the executive committee, *ex officio*. The naming of chairs allows you to recognize the movers and shakers of the organization and to share power and authority with them. Assignment of other faculty to committees allows them to add a line to their annual service report and, more important, to be involved in the functioning of the department in some capacity that is meaningful to them.

There are doubtless many additional tactics and strategies for accomplishing the major mission of encouraging scholarship and motivating performance in general, and some additional hints will be found in the other chapters in this book. The ones I have proposed here have been particularly successful in my own, particularly those centering on informal brown-bag seminars, performance profiles, and mentoring.

CHAPTER 9

Employing and Managing Part-Time Faculty in Foreign Languages

---

Herman F. Bostick
Howard University

During the past two decades, there has been a fairly rapid increase in employment of part-time or adjunct faculty by American colleges and universities. Foreign language departments have not escaped the impact of this; to the contrary, they have been heavily affected by it. The widespread use of part-time foreign language instructors has added a new dimension to the role of the department chairperson which demands that greater care be given to the screening, management, and evaluation of part-time instructors.

Because of the substantial increase in the number of part-time faculty teaching in colleges and universities today, and because of the complexities of academic and legal requirements and attendant ramifications, it has become mandatory that institutions of higher education have in place or move to develop expeditiously sound policies governing the employment and management of part-time faculty. These policies are to be implemented in all units of the institution. This mandate involves chairpersons directly and requires that they become well informed on the policies and practices governing part-time instructors under their supervision. A thorough knowledge of these policies on the part of foreign language chairpersons will contribute immeasurably to the effective use of part-time instructors and may spare the department and college or university some embarrassing and sometimes costly litigation.

The definition of part-time or adjunct faculty varies from one college to another. However, a common understanding of these terms is that individuals thus employed teach fewer hours and have less departmental responsibility than full-time faculty. Thus, a vital task that incumbent and prospective chairpersons face is how to manage effectively and equitably part-time instructors in foreign languages. In the pages that follow, the author offers some guidelines for accomplishing this task.

A major responsibility of the foreign language chairperson is to ensure that the department is staffed with well-trained and linguistically competent instructional personnel. Therefore, the academic training and linguistic competence of persons to be employed as part-time faculty should be carefully evaluated to certify to the fullest extent possible that their academic and professional credentials are comparable to those of full-time faculty holding the same position or rank. If a doctoral degree is usually required for persons employed at a particular rank, the part-time appointee for that rank should either have the doctorate or should have made substantial progress toward achieving it. To employ part-time or adjunct faculty with qualifications that are less than comparable to those of full-time colleagues holding the same rank or position in the department can undermine academic integrity and threaten departmental collegiality and faculty morale.

The chairperson should also seek to employ part-time faculty who have had some college or university teaching experience. Where this is not feasible, she/he may wish to assign an experienced full-time faculty member to serve as mentor for the new instructor. Such an arrangement serves at least two important functions: 1) It ensures that the quality of instruction will not be jeopardized, and 2) It gives the new, inexperienced instructor a seasoned colleague with whom to interact on a day-to-day basis.

Proper documentation for part-time faculty is very important and necessary. The chairperson should be knowledgeable about the various documents that the college or university requires for part-time faculty employment and should obtain current copies of each one. Most institutions require the prospective appointee to provide a current *curriculum vitae*, a specified number of letters of recommendation (usually three), valid academic transcripts, and copies of peer and student evaluations if the candidate has had recent prior teaching experience. A personal interview with the candidate is highly recommended if it can be arranged without placing too great a burden on the candidate or the department chairperson. The interview should involve faculty other than the chairperson at some point, affording the candidate an opportunity to meet and interact with prospective colleagues and adding an aura of dignity to the position and to the candidate. The involvement of full-time faculty in the hiring process for part-time colleagues can contribute to lessening or eliminating any possible barriers to full acceptance of the new faculty members when they join the department.

An appropriate question that the chairperson may ask her/himself when evaluating a prospective part-time appointee is: Would this candidate be considered for a full-time instructional position in the department if one should become available?

Part-time teachers in departments of foreign languages are usually appointed as temporary faculty or on a year-to-year basis as long as the need exists. As temporary faculty, the individual is appointed for a specified period of time (one semester, two semesters, etc.), and the contract should clearly state this. Employment on a year-to-year basis offers a type of "open-ended" affiliation with the department which may continue each year as long as there is a need, thus giving an illusion of permanency. Where year-to-year part-time employment is operative, the chairperson should make certain that the part-time appointee fully understands the nature, letter, and intent of the contract of employment.

Most colleges and universities have published policies and guidelines for employing part-time faculty which cover matters of financial remuneration, contracts, faculty benefits, teaching load, other professional responsibilities, performance evaluation, promotion and tenure, grievance, affirmative action, and due process. It is incumbent upon the department chairperson to become familiar with the policies and guidelines in effect at the institution. If the college or university has no such policies or guidelines, the chairperson and the department's executive committee or tenured faculty would do well to develop departmental policies and guidelines for the employment and management of part-time faculty. The importance of having in place such policies cannot be overemphasized since implementation of equal opportunity and affirmative action guidelines occurs mainly in the academic unit, in this case in the department of foreign languages.

Remuneration for part-time faculty ought to be commensurate with the instructor's academic qualifications, professional experience, and teaching load. The salary should be sufficiently attractive so that well trained and highly motivated candidates will be encouraged to apply. A flat salary for part-time faculty should be avoided because over time it diminishes the professional statùre of both the position and the individual who fills it. The chairperson should take an active interest in determining the salary package for part-time faculty in foreign languages in order to safeguard excellence in foreign language instruction. A system of remuneration for part-time faculty should contain a built-in factor for cost of living increases, for inflation, and for any meritorious achievement or change in rank.

Fringe benefits for part-time faculty vary widely from institution to institution. Therefore, it is very important for the chairperson, the dean, or personnel officer to make available to the prospective part-time instructor unambiguous information on fringe benefits for part-time faculty at the institution. According to Biles and Tuckerman, some institutions offer no fringe benefits to part-time faculty. Others may offer a combination of two or more benefits such as social security and life insurance; or partial life insurance, partial retirement, and social security; or some other combination of these benefits which may include library privileges, parking and/or subsidized meals in the faculty dining room or club.[1] Because there is no standard package of fringe benefits for part-time faculty, the chairperson or a representative from the office of personnel should discuss with the part-time appointee the benefits offered by the employing institution. While such discussion may be of little value for the temporary appointee, it is of utmost significance to the year-to-year appointee who may remain in the department for any number of years.

As administrative head of the foreign language department, the chairperson has the responsibility to implement the institution's affirmative action and equal opportunity plan and policies. It is his/her responsibility to ensure that announcements of departmental vacancies reach a wide and diverse pool of applicants in terms of race, sex, age, etc.; to provide a fair and equitable system of evaluating part-time faculty performance; and to provide a conducive work environment and opportunity for professional growth and improvement. Since colleges and universities are required to publish their statement on affirmative action and equal opportunity employment, it is a simple matter to provide part-time faculty with a copy.

In addition to handling the aforementioned tasks, the chairperson should keep a record of each activity in the recruitment and employment process for part-time faculty. Periodically, institutions are subjected to an equal opportunity compliance review during which all administrative units are required to submit a report on their hiring practices. The departmental report usually contains the following information: title of faculty position, name of department, type of contract, job description, list of publications in which the vacancy announcement appeared, the number of responses received, effort made to ensure diversity of applicant pool, the number of applications screened, the number of applications seriously considered; name, race, sex of each applicant interviewed but not employed, criteria to determine that the candidate hired was best for the position; name, race, sex of candidate employed; names, race, and sex of members of the search or screening committee; names of approving officials, date of official approval, date of submission to the affirmative action office, date of approval by the affirmative action office.[2] This record should be prepared simultaneously with the act of employment to ensure accuracy of all information contained in it.

Fundamental to effective integration of part-time faculty into the departmental program is providing the new appointee with a written contract, a job description, and a statement of the department's philosophy. Together, these three documents give the new faculty member a feeling of security and a sense of belonging. Part-time faculty should be accepted as colleagues in the department, not as hired help. They should be provided with unambiguous information about their teaching schedules and other duties and responsibilities. The department's system of faculty evaluation should be explained to them as well as its relevance for part-time faculty. The general objective is to develop a healthy *esprit de corps* among the foreign language faculty. In this regard, a special welcoming reception might be held for the new appointees. Such a reception can prove very effective for departments that employ a sizeable number of part-time faculty in overcoming barriers, in creating a greater sense of collegiality, and in fostering greater departmental loyalty and cooperation. Another important aspect of integrating part-time faculty into the departmental program is acquainting them with the institution's grievance process, with collective bargaining rights, and with due process as these relate to and affect their employment status.

Although the chairperson of foreign languages is expected to be knowledgeable about each one of the topics discussed in the foregoing pages, she/he will find it beneficial to consult from time to time with the appropriate administrative officers responsible for implementing campus-wide the policies and practices governing academic employment, personnel management, remuneration, affirmative action, collective bargaining, and the like. Institutional circumstances and policies change, and these may not always be disseminated to academic units expeditiously. The initiative in establishing on-going contacts with these offices should originate with the department chairperson.

NOTES

[1] George F. Biles and Howard P. Tuckerman, *Part-time Faculty Personnel Management Policies* (New York: Macmillan, 1986): 53.

[2] Biles and Tuckerman 22-23.

CHAPTER 10

Grantsmanship: Establishing a Process

Ray A. Verzasconi
Oregon State University

Money chases money, which is to say that what follows is not intended for department chairs whose faculty are already successful in obtaining grants and fellowships, but for those who have little or no experience in this area. In addition, my focus will be on individual grant projects, rather than those involving several faculty members or cooperative or consortia projects involving several departments or colleges.[1]

Specifically, my perspective comes from the experience of my own department.[2] Until 1988, our grant and fellowship record was minimal: one or two individual grants or fellowships a year, rarely exceeding $1,000 each, and most of them from internal sources. In the past three academic years, faculty have submitted a total of twenty-four individual grant proposals or fellowship applications, twenty of which have been funded or received. Sources have been both internal and external. Grants have ranged from $400 to $21,000 (for a total of more than $80,000), have funded research, curriculum development, and improvement of teaching, and have included such items as teaching-load reduction, national and international travel, and acquisition of foreign language video material and computer hardware and software.[3]

Two factors convinced me of the need to improve our department's grant record when I was appointed chair in 1989. First, some five years ago the university president and the provost sought to improve the visibility and reputation of the College of Liberal Arts by making internal grant funds more readily accessible to faculty in the college and by expanding the role of the university's Research Office to include support for the liberal arts. Of course, with that new commitment also came increased expectations for scholarly research and improvement of teaching for purposes of promotion and tenure.

Secondly, the state's decreasing support for higher education was an equally motivating factor. Budget cuts of four percent and twelve percent in the immediate past and current biennia, respectively, and the prospect of a twenty percent cut in 1993-95 have created an imperative to seek grant funding and private contributions to avoid even further retrenchment and the total destruction of faculty morale—a reality clearly facing public higher education in many states.[4]

While we have enjoyed modest success, I would stress that before trying to motivate faculty to devote time and energy applying for grants, department chairs need to be convinced that success will not be used against the department; that is, the deans or other administrators will not automatically offset grant funds received by making additional cuts in existing departmental budgets. Chairs also need to be very honest and up front with faculty interested in projects that will require continued funding after the grant ends. As we well know, there are no one hundred percent guarantees of continued funding in our profession. A pledge or commitment of continued internal funding must always be clearly understood in the context of the well-worn phrase, "if funds are available."[5]

Department chairs who wish to motivate faculty to seek grant funding will more likely be successful in their efforts if they make an advance commitment of staff resources to assist faculty, specifically, in the form of a department grantsperson. In our department, my management assistant devotes about one-fourth of her time to the tasks described below. In smaller departments, the tasks might have to be undertaken by the chair or assigned to a faculty member who receives some form of compensation, e.g., a reduced teaching load. It could also involve the development of a time-share plan with one or more other departments for the cooperative use of an office staff person.

There are five areas in which faculty can benefit immensely from such an advance commitment of resources:

1) Identifying and cataloguing sources of grant funds and fellowships, and tracking deadlines.
2) Identifying current and future interests of individual faculty members in terms of research, curriculum development, and improvement of teaching.
3) Developing a thorough understanding of one's own institution's regulations.
4) Developing budgets.
5) Editing proposals.

Quite simply, without an advance commitment of staff resources in these areas, faculty who are or who feel overburdened by teaching and/or service responsibilities will not easily be convinced of the possible benefits of grant funding if they must do all of the preliminary leg work themselves. Even if they can be motivated to apply, it might take only one rejection notice to convince them that the dozens of hours invested in the preparation of a proposal were not worth it.

1) **Identifying sources and tracking deadlines.** While the *Federal Funding Guide for Language and International Education*, by Beth J. Nohmy (JNCL/NCLIS, 1991) identifies major sources of federal funding, and while it will be periodically updated, the *Guide* cannot speak to deadlines or specific regulations, because they often change. Moreover, the federal government is not the sole source of individual grant funding. In addition to many national foundations, local (state) foundations are sometimes a possible source.[6] My experience also tells me that many faculty members may not be fully aware of internal grant funding sources.

As important as having a departmental grantsperson become thoroughly familiar with finding sources is having that person keep track of application deadlines for faculty members. It can eliminate a typical frustration: finding out about a grant only days before the application is due.

2) **Identifying current and future interests of faculty members.** This task dovetails with the first one. It allows the departmental grantsperson to perform two important tasks: a) To bring grant and fellowship announcements to the attention of the most appropriate faculty members, rather than distributing announcements to everyone

(which merely contributes to the mass of printed materials that already fill faculty mailboxes), and b) To seek funding sources for specific faculty interests.[7] It also provides an even more important service to faculty, which I will discuss below.

3) **Understanding the institution's regulations.** All institutions have regulations regarding outside grant funding. For example, many now have complex rules governing the use of human subjects in research, which can run the gamut from interviewing authors to having students participate in classroom teaching experiments. Institutions also vary considerably in terms of determining who will actually administer a grant, i.e., who controls the funds. Will it be someone in a research office, the dean, the department chair, or the grant recipient? Whoever administers the grant can significantly affect the amount of funds the recipient or the department actually receives. For example, if a grant provides for a teaching-load reduction and a senior faculty member is replaced with a junior faculty member, will the salary differential be retained by the department? On the other hand, if a grant that involves a teaching-load reduction will not cover the institution's medical, dental, and retirement benefits—and many grants in the humanities do not—who will be expected to cover these costs for the faculty member hired to replace the recipient of the grant?

Individual faculty members should also not be expected to contact one or more campus agencies in order to gain an understanding of the many regulations that may exist; this is information that should be readily available to them in the department before they begin to write a grant proposal. Indeed, department chairs need this information before they add their recommendation or their signature to an application, lest they discover belatedly that a grant will actually drain funds from the departmental budget.

4) **Developing budgets.** Again, the development of a budget adequate to complete the intended project can be extremely time consuming if faculty members are entirely on their own. Whether dealing with a research project or curriculum development, faculty will frequently overlook many minor expenses that will be incurred. Not to include these expenses in the grant budget can undermine a project or lead to conflict between the grant recipient and department

chair. In addition, my experience has been that those who are entirely new to grantsmanship will underestimate funding needs with the mistaken notion that it will improve their chances of receiving the grant. A worthwhile project needs to be funded adequately, or it will not likely come to fruition, a fact well-known to grant proposal reviewers.

The idea is not to have the departmental grantsperson develop budgets but to assist faculty in developing budgets that are adequate to the task at hand and, again, that will not drain funds from the departmental budget.

5) **Editing proposals.** Helping faculty edit proposals can involve overcoming a major hurdle. Those of us in the humanities do not readily subscribe to the idea of cooperative ventures. Unlike our colleagues in the sciences and professional schools, or even in the social sciences, we rarely co-author articles, and we resist the move to introduce the principles of cooperative learning to our students. Whether writing an article or a grant proposal, many of us cling to the idea that the finished product must be ours and ours alone.[8]

Helping foreign language faculty accept the necessity of a team effort in order to improve the chances of obtaining grants and fellowships, therefore, may require a considerable amount of tact and an understanding of individual sensitivities. After all, we are language experts with little or no need for help from anyone else. Faculty members whose self-esteem is intact will be able to have their proposals totally rewritten; some may respond only to a kid-glove treatment; others may not be receptive to editorial advice until after they have received a few rejection notices; still others may never accept advice and will blame the system or something else for the rejection notices.

In our department, the first three support services described above are assigned to my management assistant. It may appear strange to assign her the task of identifying current and future interests of faculty members in terms of research, curriculum development and/or teaching improvement, but this is a responsibility that applies only to fellowship and grant funding possibilities. She deals with numerous wish lists which some faculty are reluctant to discuss with me until projects have a possibility of coming to fruition. Having faculty consciously articulate future wish lists, even if they change from year to year, also helps them to focus and avoid going off on a dozen different tangents, something which usually ensures that they will not accomplish their proposed projects.[9]

The fourth and fifth support services, that is, helping faculty develop budgets and editing proposals, are shared by my management assistant and me. In this respect, I require that faculty submit to me a preliminary draft of each grant proposal at least three weeks prior to the official submission deadline. Since my management assistant keeps track and informs faculty of grant deadlines, our departmental deadline has rarely presented a problem.

My management assistant also serves as the departmental liaison with both internal and external funding sources. We have found employees of both private foundations and the federal government to be extremely helpful in providing advice and suggesting revisions that will make a grant proposal more acceptable; however, given their own time constraints, few welcome telephone calls from several individuals in the same department inquiring about the same grant.

To summarize, the advance commitment of the support services described above:

1) Eliminates the need for each faculty member to reinvent the wheel;
2) Makes it easier for faculty to focus on developing a project that truly interests them, rather than trying to come up with a proposal that satisfies grant x, y, or z;
3) Eliminates many potential surprises, both for the faculty member and the department chair; and
4) Enhances the odds of receiving grant funding.

In addition to the support services described above, department chairs can encourage faculty to seek grant funding in two other, very important ways. First, they must be willing and able to reward faculty, even in a small way, for applying for grants or fellowships. The possible benefits of a grant or fellowship are not in themselves sufficient, initial motivational factors to convince many faculty members to apply. The size and form of the reward, of course, have to be commensurate with funds available, but faculty members have to be convinced in advance that the time and effort required to write a proposal will, in some way, enhance their careers.

Second, department chairs must be willing to convince faculty that grants and fellowships can be a "ticket out," not just a "ticket up." We all know why the potential implied by a Ph.D. frequently does not come to fruition. Many of the Ph.D. graduates we produce have heavy teaching loads and work at colleges and universities without graduate programs. Many seldom have an opportunity to teach an advanced-level course in their area of interest and expertise. They often have no colleagues who share their research interest, and they do not have easy access to travel funds to attend conferences where they can exchange ideas. While the stimulus provided by being a graduate student is often sufficient to carry one through the tenure and promotion process, the initial drive withers, and tenure, in effect, becomes not the promise of continuing productivity in either teaching or research, but rather the death of that promise. Discouraged by the lack of opportunities they thought the Ph.D. promised, many faculty turn inward and needlessly become "deadwood."

Even by the time they receive tenure, many realize that the only "way out" would involve a demotion; ten years later, place-bound, most are already convinced that there is no "way out." Youthful dreams and idealism die painfully. But the "way out" is not necessarily a more lucrative job offer; it can be the knowledge that one indeed does have the opportunity of once again drawing on the potential that was so much more evident ten years earlier.

Not all faculty can be convinced of the potential benefits of grants. There will always be those who give up, who no longer have an interest in research, curriculum development, or service, and who, despite evidence to the contrary, are convinced that they are outstanding teachers and, consequently, need to do nothing to improve. My experience in the past three years convinced me they are in the definite minority. For the majority, the psychological benefits of receiving a fellowship or a grant cannot be overestimated in terms of building faculty morale which, in turn, leads to improvement in teaching, research, and service.

Quite simply, when education is everywhere under attack, when higher education budgets are being slashed, when faculty are now called upon (as their public school colleagues have been for the past two decades) to help resolve society's problems and to do so with fewer resources, the receipt of even a small grant can be as stimulating as that first notice we received that an article would be published.

Others may disagree, but the advice which Dorothy James provides in her article (see endnote #1) leads to another suggestion: before considering applying for a major grant involving several faculty members in your department or faculty in several departments, concentrate on helping your own faculty obtain individual grants. This action will help you and your faculty understand the grant process, particularly as it involves your institution's regulations and budgets. And then, money chases money.

NOTES

[1] For an informative article on the problems, pitfalls, and benefits of major curriculum development grant projects, see Dorothy James, "The Aftermath of Funding: Making it Work and Making it Last," *ADFL Bulletin* 21.3 (Spring 1990): 30-34. Much of her advice is also pertinent to individual grant projects, and the prior commitment of resources I discuss in this article would be even more critical for departments seeking major grant funding.

[2] The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Oregon State University offers a B.A. degree in French, German, and Spanish, and a minor in these languages and in Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. We also participate in a university-wide M.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies, but rarely have more that one or two students enrolled in any given year. Of nineteen full-time faculty, twelve hold a Ph.D. and are expected to conduct scholarly research for purposes of promotion and tenure and merit salary increases. Excellence in teaching and advising and a commitment to curriculum development, however, remain priorities in promotion and tenure and merit salary deliberations at both the departmental and college levels.

[3] The availability of grant funds has also reduced internal competition for very limited funds in our services and supplies budget.

[4] The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts also appointed a Development Officer who works in cooperation with the Dean, the OSU Foundation, a CLA Development Council (currently comprised of fifteen OSU alumni and friends), and department chairs in an effort to increase private contributions to the college and to individual departments. A four-fold increase in annual contributions to our departmental accounts in the OSU Foundation has also provided us with a modest, but increasing, source of internal grant funds.

[5] For the same reason, when putting their stamp of approval on grants that require matching funds and/or continued funding after the grant period, chairs need to understand clearly what commitments from central administrators really involve: the use of new, recurring, or existing funds? In the latter instance, a central administrator is merely pledging funds that already exist in the departmental budget.

[6] One of our instructors used a $1,000 grant from a Portland (OR) foundation as seed money to obtain an additional $12,000 in grants, which helped her complete a major monograph recently published by the University of Wisconsin Press. Most libraries have information on local foundations and the type of research, if any, they will support. Again, however, individual faculty members should not be expected to spend hours identifying possible sources of local foundation support.

[7] I take as a given that faculty will be more successful in obtaining grants if they start with a project about which they are enthusiastic, rather than trying to tailor a proposal to fit a grant announcement that just happens to cross their desks.

[8] Aside from the fact that few of us received training in writing grants while in graduate school, as humanists we are also reluctant to suggest that we know beforehand what we are going to discover or that we have a theory of hypothesis to test. While we may rightly reject this low-context cultural bias, if we want to be successful at grantsmanship, we need to keep in mind that advice of Nobelist Albert Szent-Gyorgyi: ". . . sitting in an easy chair I can cook up anytime a project which must seem quite attractive, clear, and logical. But if I go out into nature, into the unknown . . . everything seems mixed up and contradictory, illogical and incoherent. This is what research does; it smooths out contradictions, makes things simple, logical, and coherent. So when I bring reality into my projects, they seem hazy and are rejected. The reviewers, feeling responsibility for the 'taxpayer's money,' justly hesitate to give money for research, the lines of which are not clear to the applicant himself." See Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, "Dionysians and Apollonians," *Science* 176 (June 2, 1972): 966.

[9] One of my management assistant's first tasks, when hired three years ago, was to meet individually with each interested faculty member to discuss current and future research, curriculum development, or teaching improvement projects. The twelve faculty members who availed themselves of this service now periodically meet in order to keep her updated. In the past three years, all twelve have received one or more grants and most have new proposals in the pipeline. Their renewed enthusiasm for excellence in teaching, research, and/or service also convinced me to apply for our first major ($300,000) grant.

CHAPTER 11

Staff Development for Foreign Language Faculty

Robert M. Terry
University of Richmond

Jack H. Schuster, one of the authors of *Enhancing Faculty Careers: Strategies for Development and Renewal,* has said that "the quality of education depends on what we can do to provide adequate support to all the new entrants in academe who are beginning their careers, and to all the older faculty members who may need to revitalize their careers."[1] The idea of staff development quickly brings forth a flood of negative thoughts, often based on recalcitrant rejection and a reluctance or refusal to change. But there is a positive side to staff development: retooling, rethinking, revising, reviewing, renewing, and especially rejuvenation.

> "The only difference between a
> rut and a grave is the depth."
> —Jennifer Burton

I propose that there are three basic stages of development of a university faculty. These three stages are actually points on a continuum and not distinctly separate stages. Each stage exhibits some rather stereotypical characteristics that are developmental in nature. Let us examine each of these points on the continuum, looking at the characteristics and the mind set of each.

1) *Fresh out of Graduate School: Les "arrivistes"*

These newcomers have several hurdles to overcome: they are new to the school; they are unfamiliar with the students, operational procedures, curriculum, and the individual faculty members' interests and areas of specialization. Many suffer from *gradschoolitis*, i.e., "I'm so used to an extraordinary workload that I expect the same from my undergraduate students." Over an extended period of time, these hurdles can be slowly surmounted, and often extraordinary expectations and demands become tempered by the pragmatics of the realistic abilities of students in courses that should still remain demanding.

New (and younger) faculty members are frequently considered "young turks" by the older, established faculty who are often resistant to changes and innovations proposed by newer, untenured faculty. For fear of alienating their senior colleagues who will evaluate them for tenure and promotion in five or six years, these junior faculty members are often eager to please by not making waves.

On the positive side, many new faculty members bring an exciting enthusiasm to their new job. Many, depending on their training, bring with them new and fresh perspectives. They also bring along a familiarity with current pedagogical practices which are often at variance with certain foreign language teaching practices in their new school. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that their interests, enthusiasm, and efforts be sustained and shared with their colleagues and not be directed toward satisfying totally personal goals.

2) *The Newly Established, Tenured Faculty: Les "arrivé(e)s"*

As faculty members develop in their academic career, they slowly and inexorably become set in their ways, having apparently found their own successful methods of teaching in a variety of courses ranging from lower-level ("required") courses that are typically highly participatory in nature to more lecture-based upper-level, specialized courses. Quite often, the longer the faculty member remains at a given school teaching a relatively consistent sequence and range of courses, the more resistant to change he/she becomes.

On the positive side, the faculty in this middle group find themselves in a period of productive research and active involvement in professional organizations. Certain faculty members are now becoming recognized as experts in their area(s) of specialization. Unfortunately, while their expertise is recognized by but not often shared with their colleagues at their own school, they do share their knowledge with colleagues who a) come to hear their presentations at professional meetings, b) read their articles in professional journals or in books, c) teach at other institutions at a significant distance from the expert's own school, and d) pay an honorarium for the opportunity to hear them.

3) *The Senior Faculty: Les "figé(e)s"*

This is the most secure and established group of faculty. They have sought and eventually found their own teaching style, be it successful or unsuccessful. These are the experts. They are also the most stereotypically resistant to change.

Being the experts, they should be role models for the junior faculty. Nonetheless, they, too, should be continuing to develop, to keep up with the changes in education, to maintain their enthusiasm for teaching and their "freshness" in the classroom. It is patently true that stability and lack of change are synonymous with rigor mortis.

A faculty can stagnate by not seeking renewal and rejuvenation through efforts of ongoing development, and as a consequence, they will assuredly deal a death blow to a program. Foreign languages are dynamic: they are in a continuous state of development and change. We should reflect this dynamism in our own thinking and teaching.

Teachers at the K-12 levels must periodically renew their teaching certificates by participating in a variety of activities, including enrolling in undergraduate- and graduate-level courses in their discipline. This requirement helps assure that they keep up to date in that discipline and that they stay abreast of current pedagogical developments. Such is not the case with college/university faculty. It is indeed surprising how many foreign language faculty members are not yet familiar with the concepts of proficiency and communicative competence. It is equally surprising how many faculty members remain computer illiterate. There is simply no excuse for the slowly graying professoriate to maintain the status quo and to remain ignorant of changes, developments, and advances in foreign language education. Nor is there any excuse not to expect neophyte faculty to be involved in faculty development, thereby exposing them to varieties of teaching styles and focuses of instruction before they move into the realm of the established teachers, a realm that is often characterized by an insidious inflexibility.

Staff development leads to professional well-being. Efforts to provide staff development opportunities for the foreign language faculty can be directed toward all aspects of their various fields of interest, whether it is scholarly work in languages, literature, culture, or pedagogy; the improvement of teaching skills; or stressing the personal growth of professors. As Jack Schuster's statement indicates, staff development should "provide adequate support to all the new entrants in academe who are beginning their careers, and to all the older faculty members who may need to revitalize their careers," not ignoring that middle group of faculty members who have recently been awarded tenure, who are beginning to shape their professional reputation, and who, over a relatively long period, run the risk of becoming firmly inured to one specific mode of teaching.

It is incumbent upon every department head/chair to ensure that the entire faculty of the foreign language department has the opportunity to avail itself of the widest variety of staff development opportunities. The most obvious first step is through encouraging and supporting the faculty. Moral and personal support and interest in each individual faculty member are the keys to success, for without them, financial support, in most cases, is of little benefit. Certainly, without financial support, it would be fruitless to fan the coals of enthusiasm.

It is obvious that there are varied areas of interest within a department. It would be impractical to expect each faculty member to try to develop fully and competently in all areas or even to have a deep-seated interest in all areas. Nonetheless, the faculty must be receptive to ideas and suggestions that are directed toward the well-being of the department and its program(s) and not so narrowly focused that they lose sight of the whole in deference to their own specific "bailiwick." Faculty members must realize that each person contributes to the success of the entire foreign language program. As trite as the saying may be, a chain is as strong as its weakest link.

Institutional support is a *sine qua non* of effective staff development. If the institution sees its component departments as integral parts of a vital whole, then it should offer the necessary support to ensure that its faculty not become stagnant. What kinds of institutional support are available?

Released time. The concept of released time was developed to provide individual faculty members with a reduced schedule of teaching obligations so that they can engage in academic pursuits that will help them develop personally and that will, at the same time, make a strong contribution to the department and to its program(s). When faculty are engaged in certain long-term projects that lead to the production of immediate, timely outcomes, or when pertinent one-time opportunities arise, it is appropriate for that faculty member to request released time. It is not appropriate to request released time every semester in order to carry out ongoing research on long-term projects that have very limited outcomes or simply in an effort to try to reduce the normal teaching load by one course. The department head/chair should weigh the impact of the support of released time against 1) the staffing situation for courses that will be offered in the next quarter, trimester, or semester—courses that are essential to the specific program; and 2) the contributions that such released time can eventually make to the entire department or program(s).

Sabbatical Leave. The sabbatical leave program is provided by an institution for the enrichment of the teaching capabilities and the professional growth of its faculty members. In most cases, a sabbatical leave for one semester is granted with full salary, a year-long sabbatical with one-half salary. A sabbatical leave removes the faculty member from all teaching (and other) responsibilities for the duration for which it is granted. Such an opportunity allows the faculty member to pursue extended research and travel for a variety of purposes which should provide professional and personal enrichment and growth, all of which should still, in the long run, make a contribution to the institution and its program(s). One is eligible for a sabbatical leave generally after a certain period of service to the institution, often after each six years, with the sabbatical taken in the seventh year.

Leave of Absence. Other than sabbatical leaves, leave time may be granted to a faculty member as leaves of absence. These are generally of two types: those taken for personal reasons or to fulfill the requirements of an advanced degree, and those taken under a grant or fellowship. Most often, faculty members on a leave of absence ordinarily do not receive a salary during that period.

International Institutional Support. Most universities offer a variety of sources for international funding for special purposes. There is often a faculty research committee that promotes and encourages faculty research and scholarly activities, with funds being budgeted by the institution to support research, travel, and publication by its faculty.

Quite often there is another committee dedicated to the enhancement of teaching effectiveness. This internal funding source provides a variety of teaching enrichment grants which will allow faculty members to attend seminars on teaching effectiveness, to carry out research designed to improve an individual faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and to acquire minor equipment and supplies designed to improve teaching effectiveness.

In the fall of 1992, for example, the Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures at the University of Richmond received an internal $3,695 grant from P.E.T.E. [the Program on the Enhancement of Teaching Effectiveness] for a two-day training workshop for the entire faculty of the department and assistant teachers (drill instructors) in our accelerated and traditional lower-level language courses. With this grant, we were able to bring professors John Rassias and Micheline Lyons, both of Dartmouth College, to our campus for an in-depth training program. With a complete teaching staff of 28 in the department and with approximately 42 assistant teachers (drill instructors) in attendance, both groups worked closely together for the two days.

The Office of Foundation and Government Grants. Many schools have an office that is responsible for initiating, coordinating, and directing proposals to foundations and government agencies, particularly those organizations created to assist academic programs and faculties. The director of such an office is trained in grantsmanship, i.e., the writing of grants according to specified guidelines. These grants include, among others, NEH and Rockefeller grants for summer study.

Institutionally-budgeted Travel Funds. The department head/chair is often in charge of allocating institutionally-budgeted travel funds. Travel to professional meetings is a primary source of professional renewal and rejuvenation. However, with the current economic situation, budgetary cutbacks have greatly reduced such travel funds, and when available, they most often prove insufficient in view of the escalating cost of travel, food, lodging, and registration fees for conferences. It is essential, nonetheless, for the institution to make a financial commitment for its faculty to attend and participate in professional meetings. It is the job of the head/chair to make certain that travel funds are allocated equitably to those who request them, insofar as such allocation is financially feasible and practical.

It is clear that the department head/chair is a resource person for his/her faculty, encouraging them to apply for both internal and external grants, for the appropriate leaves and released time, for participation in developmental programs both on and off campus. But the department head/chair should also be an initiator, even an instigator, by setting up periodic staff development opportunities for the faculty. He/She should share, with the appropriate faculty members, information relevant to staff development that crosses his/her desk. The chair should especially encourage sharing among departmental colleagues. In an informal conversation, one colleague said to another: "Isn't it a shame that you travel all over the country and abroad presenting workshops and helping others, and none of us here has ever heard what you have to say?" The sharing and exchange of ideas among colleagues are enormously important in maintaining the morale factor of the faculty, as well as in illustrating the importance of on-going faculty development. It is also a very healthy activity.

One primary opportunity for staff development is strategic planning that often takes the form of a periodic self-study. Such an occasion forces the faculty to question its very essence. Are we effectively doing what we claim to do? If not, what can we do? How can we change to make our program(s) even more effective? This internal soul-searching leads the faculty to carry out a significant amount of research on what is going on at other schools and in the profession at large. The obvious goal of such a self-study is to review the department's current activities, to effect changes in program(s) where needed, and to develop plans for the future.

There are many questions that can be asked in a self-study, questions that are relevant to the department's particular program goals, to the curriculum that reflects those goals, and to teaching in this specific discipline. We should also question our methodological and pedagogical emphases, taking into consideration the characteristics and interests of both the students and the faculty. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that our very *raison d'être* is our students.

Individual faculty members are expected to continue to develop throughout their career. In fact, the very nature of the teaching profession is also that of constantly learning. The longer faculty members teach, the more difficult it is to keep in the proper perspective the amount of work that they demand. It would indeed be a challenge to established faculty members to enroll in a beginning-level language class and to face the fear, trepidation, and insecurity of the rest of the students in the class. How quickly we lose sight of the novelty of our classes: learning our class content is a fresh activity for new groups of students each semester, but teaching the same course has become a repetitive routine to us.

The department head/chair must assume that all faculty have a strong motivation to continue to develop throughout their career. He/She must also realize that such is often not the case. There are indeed occasions when the head/chair of a department should step in as the initiator of staff and individual development. He/She must clearly understand the situation in which each of the three faculty groups mentioned above finds itself. Each of the stages of development of the faculty has its own ruts, particularly in stages 2 and 3, but there are also potential dangers in stage 1. Ruts begin as a series of behaviors that become established throughout one's career. They are created on a trial-and-error basis. Some prove to be impractical; others lead us straight toward our goals. In the latter case, ruts can be good, provided the ruts do not get too deep. They provide a path to follow, a path that we hope leads to success in the classroom. When the ruts get too deep, one can either create new ones, or slowly but surely transform them into graves.

Creating a new path is exciting and challenging. At the beginning of this chapter is listed a group of six key words that help define what is meant by staff development: retooling, rethinking, revising, reviewing, renewing, and rejuvenation. We can become rejuvenated in our teaching careers if we make a concerted effort to avoid creating and maintaining ruts that are too deep. Just as each semester's group of students views our classes as new, so should we strive to make them new for ourselves. How? Retool. Rethink. Revise. Review. Renew. Rejuvenate.

NOTE

[1] Debra E. Blum, "Colleges Urged to Prepare for a Gap Between Young and Old Professors," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 28 Feb. 1990: A22.

CHAPTER 12

Coordinating Foreign Language Graduate Teaching Assistants

Spurgeon W. Baldwin
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

In a "Chairperson's Primer," it seems appropriate to approach the subject of coordination of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) from a broader institutional perspective, and therefore this essay will not have as its purpose merely to give the outline of a "how to" manual. I will also devote some attention to the function of the GTA instructional system within the context of the university.

First, a brief description of the typical program: Newly accepted graduate students, most often with no previous experience as classroom teachers, are granted teaching assistantships. The graduate school or the department conducts a brief orientation, a crash course in pedagogy, and then sends the students off to class, where they follow a pre-established syllabus, which not only gives a step-by-step prescription for the conduct of the course, but fixes the basic components in the grading system. New assistants may be required to attend an ongoing practicum, during which they continue to learn the elements of pedagogical theory and its practical application and are coached through the course syllabus. They are given instruction in the principles of testing, and they in time participate in the composition of common examinations, as well as in the subsequent grading process.

In actual practice, some of these elements may be missing, or they may be put into practice in a perfunctory way. In spite of institutional provision for supervision, "TAs are virtually in control of their individual sections" (Azevedo, 18). It seems appropriate to remark at this point that, in putting brand-new graduate teaching assistants in positions of virtual autonomy in the classroom, the university places its accreditation in possible jeopardy, for accreditation standards not only call for supervisory procedures, but also they typically exclude graduate assistants from the classroom until they have taken a significant number of graduate courses. There are some programs in this country which do not allow new M.A. students in the classroom until they have had a semester of training, including a methods course and practice teaching, but in many institutions new graduate students are immediately pressed into service.

The use of graduate students to teach elementary language is not a new phenomenon, for it was fairly widespread by the 1930s. With what might reasonably be called a "boom" in higher education following World War II, there was pressure to meet increased demand for language instruction. Such increased demand inevitably attracted graduate students in relatively large numbers. With a perhaps inevitable decline in the traditional intellectual ideals associated with the Ph.D., creating in the Ph.D.-holding university faculty a growing impression of the inferiority of these neophytes and a growing psychological gulf between the ideals of high intellectualism and the banalities of language instruction.

In the early stages of the "boom," elementary language instruction was simply delegated to candidates for higher degree, who were given a textbook and sent off to class. This system was to some extent viable, based on the presumption that the regular faculty were mentors for their graduate students on an individual basis, not only in pursuit of advanced degrees but in their language instructional duties, but the situation grew out of hand with the mushrooming of the language instruction component, the proportions of which soon led faculties to the conclusion that some sort of "coordination" was needed.

It was inevitable that the duties of coordination should be assigned to that member of the "regular" faculty judged least capable in and inclined toward "normal" scholarly activities. This person, also inevitably, became a victim of further polarization. As time passed, coordination duties were routinely assigned to new, untenured faculty who not only were not accepted on equal footing with the rest of the faculty, but who were to find it increasingly difficult to attain equal status, precisely because of the burden of their administrative assignment, with heavy duties which tended to guarantee the non-achievement of higher intellectual distinction.

In the isolated language instructional environment there began to develop the idea that intellectual distinction in language instruction was indeed possible, i.e., those charged with administration of the elementary language programs began to develop a self-image of professional respectability. The students-themselves began to see it no longer as merely a way to be able to eat while they climbed the ivory tower, but as a legitimate professional goal in itself, and the university began to perceive that graduate study must prepare students not only for high intellectualism as professors in institutions of higher education, but for elementary language teaching as well. The result has been that the ivory tower syndrome probably no longer predominates in this country's universities, but there is nevertheless a perception that is still widespread, that its goal is to "train intellectuals, not professionals," and that it fails to prepare students for the "real world" (Van Cleve, 18).

The isolation of the pedagogical specialist has resulted in an adversarial relationship within the faculty environment; while traditional Ph.D. faculties have had to recognize the necessity of supervisors for language instruction, they have often denied to these specialists any measure of intellectual respectability. Such disdain has provoked acrimonious indignation (Lalande, 15-18).

The rising curve of primary training in pedagogy thus intercepts the descending curve of faculty esteem. Under these circumstances we can make two general observations: having relegated elementary language instruction to inferiors, the "real" faculty then adopt the position that the level of language proficiency attained by the students is also inferior, and conclude that pedagogical specialists have no legitimate claim to respectability if they cannot produce a quality product. All of this is patently self-fulfilling.

The polarization in the regular faculty is also seen in the graduate student population. Again, there are two scenarios. In one of these, the graduate teaching assistants, while obliged to perform language instruction in order to support themselves, do so with a certain level of detachment and disdain, as they gravitate toward the high intellectual tasks expected of them. At the other end of the spectrum and driven by the monumental instructional obligations, high intellectualism is eschewed, little attention is paid to original inquiry into literature or linguistics, and M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations are conceived in a much more mechanical way, all of which militates for graduate programs designed to produce a "professionally trained" product for the "real world." Fortunately, not all of those who address the reality of professional training have such a one-sided point of view. In this regard, see Milton M. Azevedo's "Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training versus Education" for a thoughtful consideration of professional training not as an end in itself, but as part of intellectual education at the highest level (24-26).

In our discussion of the coordination of instruction in elementary language we are never talking exclusively about graduate teaching assistants, for in most, and maybe nearly all, institutions the number of qualified students in the language department's graduate program is not sufficient to meet all instructional needs, especially if the institution is both large and possessed of a broad requirement in the foreign languages for all undergraduate students. In this situation the elementary language instruction is carried out in part by bona fide graduate teaching assistants with pedagogical qualifications in the language, but also by graduate students (often native speakers) from other departments in the same institution, and by a sometimes small, sometimes large, cadre of temporary instructors, persons with a wide range of professional qualifications who have one thing in common: they are tied to the community by personal circumstances. While some of these people may display impressive academic credentials and professional dedication, on the other end of the continuum there are also temporary instructors with minimum to adequate qualifications and adequate to zero professional dedication. As a last resort, when competent instructors can no longer be found in the three categories identified above, undergraduate native speakers from the language department as well as from other departments in the university may be pressed into service. Considering all of this, the task of coordination becomes much more complicated than it may seem at first glance.

There is a serious philosophical problem with regard to campus-wide language requirements (not with the existence of the requirements, but with the degree of intellectual rigor demanded in the execution of the policy): if language study is required of all students, what level of competence can we reasonably demand and not bring down on ourselves the collective wrath of the rest of the institution? Do we simply lower standards, and everyone is happy, in the same way that certain (usually humanistic) courses come to be known as "easy," and attract hundreds of indolent students to large lecture halls? Such a stance may court educational disaster.

The language department may find it easier to identify than to live up to objective standards. In order to staff the elementary language classes, there is real pressure to attract as many students as possible to the graduate programs, and it is equally obvious that this is a factor not only in the quality of the elementary instructional program, but in the quality of the graduate program itself, its rigor and intellectual standards. On campuses with broad foreign language requirements, I know of very few graduate programs which can claim that the number of fully qualified applicants is excessive.

Even if we view the intellectual trajectory in the area of language instruction and its theoretical foundations in a positive light, we run the risk of putting the students whose elementary language training has been carried out according to the independently developed methodology and standards (whatever the methodology's virtues may be) in a difficult position, for they have to make what is sometimes a quantum leap from elementary language training provided by the pedagogues to upper-level studies which are the purview of the "real" faculty. There is a persistent opinion among upper-level faculty that students do not acquire the language skills needed for upper-level work. The literature faculty continues to expect of the students (or indeed expects more and more) linguistic precision and sophisticated reading ability, while their classes may have emphasized the ability to understand the spoken language and express oneself verbally, to achieve "communication" which is the goal of contemporary methodology.

The solution is simple enough to formulate: to make sure that student linguistic achievement matches upper level expectations and that these expectations are reasonable, it is in a department's best interests to foster the liaison between faculty charged with the elementary language program and those who do literature. The second year is the crucial transition period, wherein the final basics of the language are meshed with preparation for advanced study in culture, linguistics, and literature. Every effort should be made to have full faculty input here, and it might even be that elementary language instruction can take on a special character, to the extent that the voice of the literature and linguistics faculty is heard. Just as seminars and discussion groups on linguistic and literary topics are a regular feature of upper-level programs, similar activities dealing with pedagogy and the exploration of pedagogical problems, especially those related to advanced study, should also take place.

Against this varied background, let us now consider some of the problems associated with putting elementary language instruction on a broad scale in the hands of graduate teaching assistants:

1) Leaving aside the often minimal intellectual formation of the beginning GTA, one of the main problems is youth and inexperience, often reflected in a tendency to think and act as one of the students, rather than as a professionally trained mentor. Failure to establish an appropriate professional environment in the classroom may have disastrous consequences if, in a too-informal atmosphere, personal relationships develop between a young teaching assistant and a student: we can say categorically that such relationships are detrimental to proper professional conduct of the class, and if the relationships turn from serious to sour in what is properly called a "power" situation, the conditions are ripe for possible sexual harassment.

2) In an environment with built-in potential for conflict between obligations as classroom teachers in elementary language and pursuit of more lofty academic goals, much depends on a positive, collegial attitude, and among the graduate students there are always some who offend the cooperative majority by failing to approach their duties in good faith. The department chair must above all be vigilant, for things will only go well through the combined efforts of all those involved, and without a determined pro-active spirit of cooperation, the program may be seriously impaired.

3) A related problem arises from the failure of certain GTAs to achieve an acceptable level of professional responsibility and dependability (for example, missing class with the same insouciance they had sometimes shown as undergraduates). This kind of unprofessional attitude is often a by-product of intellectual disdain for language instruction and the supervisor.

4) Especially in larger departments, where literally thousands of students are given elementary language instruction each semester, the scheduling problems involved in dove-tailing teaching responsibilities with academic programs are immense. In these

circumstances, priority must always be given to the GTA's academic program, and the temptation to resolve difficulties based on scheduling expediency must be resisted.

5) Graduate students from other departments may have limited opportunity or inclination to participate fully and energetically in the language instruction program. They will sometimes tend to regard it as a job, a burden to be borne in order to be able to eat. A low level of dedication may be a more severe problem in the case of the temporary instructor. In the case of graduate students from other departments, the pressures of their own academic programs may reduce their effective dedication to the pedagogical program in language, but if they perform at a less than satisfactory level, the institution has at least some form of direct control over their destiny. If they do not perform satisfactorily as TAs, there may be repercussions in their own programs of study, not the least of which would be the loss of a tuition waiver. On the other hand, an otherwise unattached temporary instructor, having no such institutional ties, and often burdened with incompatible responsibilities elsewhere (such as another job), is someone over whom we have only the most tenuous control, and that person can cause serious harm if he or she performs poorly and then abandons ship.

6) If there is a shortage of qualified instructors, to yield to the temptation to allow GTAs to teach a heavier load (with parallel and obligatory reduction in the amount of graduate work which can be taken for credit) delays progress toward a degree not only in that it will take longer to fulfill course work requirements, but also, by providing a significantly larger stipend, may tend to make the teaching assistant more comfortable economically and as a result less diligent in pursuit of the degree. A related danger lies in the creation of an impression of favoritism among those instructors who are not asked to teach more (and consequently earn more).

On the other hand, there are legitimate reasons for differential duties connected with providing the graduate with a variety of experience. While there may be little opportunity for variety in a graduate program which offers only the Master's degree, the case is different with those programs which also offer the Ph.D. For the post-Master's student, the opportunity may—even should—be provided to take on a more organic role in the program through participation in the administration of the elementary language program and through a variety of teaching experiences, including even third-year language and the introductory courses to advanced study in linguistics and literature. There are compelling arguments in favor of such advanced Ph.D. students receiving differential stipends, but we should always remember that this also runs the danger of creating an impression of favoritism. In my view, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

Let us now turn to the program itself, and first of all its methodology: a paradox of the era of mature teaching methodology in the foreign languages is that, while the field has developed for itself an impressive level of professionalism vis-à-vis its own scholarship and publications, the practice of subjecting the tangible results of language instruction to national achievement norms has to a great extent been neglected. Such standardization seems to me essential for two reasons. First, the validity of the method needs to be tested in the laboratory, which is the classroom, and against the experimental control represented by the national norms. The first and most obvious objective is to establish the credibility of our programs, but we should also note that through accurate analysis of national norms, on-campus practice, and the situation in the secondary schools, we will be able to institute effective placement procedures for appraisal of previous language study and integration of students from the secondary schools (as well as those who transfer from other colleges and universities) into our instructional programs. Liaison with the education college *and* with the secondary schools and their teachers is crucial if we are to maximize mutual awareness of level of accomplishment and subsequent expectations in the university environment. It is important to recognize that this is not just some kind of fuzzy-headed ideal. Consider for example the concrete question of whether the subjunctive is taught in a two-year high school program; because in practice it sometimes, and even often times, is not taught, and leaving aside the question of whether it should be taught or not, the university, for proper "articulation," needs to know. Through such liaison, we will accomplish three goals: we will 1) learn what is actually going on in the schools; 2) coordinate high school and university language programs; 3) help bring to the teachers in the schools the latest methodology. The point should also be made here that the latest methodology is in large part precisely what the best teachers in the schools are actually doing. We must never assume that the relationship between secondary school and university knowledge flows in only one direction: it is clearly a two-way street.

A word of caution with regard to a methodology which tends to require in the teacher both near-native competence and a firm methodological foundation. [The instructor] "must have both a near native command of the target language and a sound theoretical understanding of its synchronic and pragmatic aspects" (Azevedo, 19). There may be compelling reasons for modification of the method in the real world of elementary instruction by graduate teaching assistants. The average beginning graduate student may have neither the linguistic competence nor the theoretical underpinning to achieve the more ambitious goals of the method. While I would not advocate a return to the practices of the past, it will sometimes produce better results if the method is based on thoughtful distillation of the language as used by a native into some kind of elixir which contains a large dosage of some of the essential elements which make up native competence, organized in such a way that the less-than-native, less-than-theoretically-sophisticated classroom teacher can effectively deliver the goods.

The "real world" which one enters on completion of a graduate degree in fact lies somewhere between the extremes of ivory tower intellectualism and the hard facts of teaching undergraduates, especially freshmen and sophomores; the most common situation in Academe is a complicated amalgam of features from both scenarios. It seems to me that we can make progress in both pedagogy and in traditional intellectualism, and that to adopt a policy of complete adherence to the one or the other is a mistake.

In order to achieve other goals, we need to do two things: broaden the traditional belletristic program to give added emphasis to cultural consideration (while language pedagogy has made its mark, a movement toward emphasis on broader cultural studies in doctoral programs is still in an embryonic phase) and institute alternate tracks, certainly at the master's level, but also in the doctoral program, designed to train teachers for the schools and junior colleges, and not just for high-powered teaching in colleges and universities. To do this most effectively, we will have to learn to foster relationships with the College of Education. A number of graduate programs around the country already have incorporated such pedagogical tracks into their programs, not only at the master's level, in the form of what is commonly called a Master of Arts in Teaching, but also in more advanced programs leading to the doctorate.

These programs should be configured so as to maintain a careful balance between professionally determined methodological standards on the one hand and helping the teaching assistants toward optimum development of their own skills on the other. Technical competence is without question a requisite, but a teacher must also have a strong sense of awareness of student needs and concomitant responsibility for their welfare. Out of this sense of responsibility a GTA may develop a high level of intensity and rapport with the class, and there is a degree of danger in imposing methodological orthodoxy if it inhibits development of the traditional human values of the dedicated teacher. Supervision and mentoring should have as their purpose not only the correction of methodological error, but giving the teaching assistant the advice and counsel needed in the formation of the sense of dedication which is the heart and soul of what Gilbert Highet described as "The Immortal Profession."

WORKS CITED

Azevedo, Milton M. "Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training Versus Education." *ADFL Bulletin* 22.1 (Fall 1990): 24-26.

Lalande, John F., II. "Redefinition of the TA Supervisor-Language-Program Coordinator Position into the Lecturer Series: A Sensible Idea?" *ADFL Bulletin* 22.2 (Winter 1991): 15-18.

Van Cleve, John. "Graduate Study and Professional Responsibilities: Bridging the Gap." *ADFL Bulletin* 18.2 (January 1987): 18-19.

CHAPTER 13

Long-Range Planning: Crisis Intervention and Putting a Troubled Department Back on Course

Charles M. Tatum
University of Arizona

I have just begun my second five-year term as head of a department that, until recently, was known throughout the profession as a pariah. I would like to share my perspective on the reasons I became interested in the position six years ago and to offer some thoughts on how a once very sick organism is now well on its way to recovery. What follows is not intended to be self-serving or self-congratulatory, but rather is meant to describe one of many possible models of how a department chair or head might go about exercising positive leadership in a troubled department in order to help put it back on course.

In 1987, I accepted the headship of a department that had been chaired by eight different heads in the preceding thirteen years, that had twice been placed in receivership, and that had been characterized by a university evaluation committee in the most negative terms. Family, friends, and colleagues typically reacted with astonishment and disbelief. "Why," I was asked, "had I of my own free will left a secure and tranquil administrative position at a smaller institution to venture forth into an area of danger and uncertainty?" I'm sure that many who knew me suspected that too many readings of *Don Quixote* had tipped my reality scale into the fantasy and delusion zone.

In retrospect, my answer today to their puzzlement is not significantly different from my response then. It would be grandiose to say that I accepted the challenge because "it was there," much like a mountain climber climbs an iceberg or an ultradistance runner goes a hundred miles over hill and dale. But at the same time, I probably had a closer affinity with such types than I was willing to admit at the time. The challenge of taking on a task that would draw on my best and deepest resources as a person and as an administrator was probably the single most important factor in accepting such a difficult assignment.

If anything, however, I underestimated what such an administrative position would require. I was convinced in 1987 that a department that had engaged in several virulent forms of self-destructive behavior for over fifteen years could be salvaged, could be put back on the right track. I remain optimistic, although my idealism has now been considerably tempered by a heavy dose of reality based on several difficult years of eye-opening and sometimes confidence-shaking experiences.

Any individual contemplating the headship of a department beset by serious problems should, once his/her sanity has been examined and determined to be reasonably intact, seek answers to the following questions: How long has the department suffered from its troubles? What, in general, is the nature of its problems and how serious are they? What specific factors have contributed to the creation and persistence of its ailments? Why have other department heads failed to exert positive leadership? How committed are current department members and the dean and other university administrators to supporting a protracted treatment of the department's ailments? How committed is the prospective department head to guiding a frustrating and often torturous process toward a long-range solution?

Like most long-term illnesses that afflict individuals, an ailing department's problems have probably taken at least several years to develop. The nature and gravity of the problems may have resulted from a number of factors, both internal and external to the department, including unwise hiring decisions involving difficult or unproductive faculty members and staff, lack of institutional support, an inherently politicized atmosphere resulting from a university's specific sociocultural circumstances, and the response of the university and departmental members to these circumstances. The department I have chaired for over five years had been perceived by the city and state's Hispanic community as antithetical to and disrespectful of its culture and history.

Once an aspiring head has obtained rather complete answers to the above questions, he/she should determine the degree of change that is reasonably possible and the corresponding role of the head in bringing about such change. In other words, one department may require immediate crisis intervention followed quickly by a series of personnel and other decisions while another may need the firm hand of a benevolent but determined head to calm troubled waters and oversee a process of more gradual change. Ultimately, each individual must decide if a department's particular needs fit his/her personal style and administrative priorities. An aggressive, take-charge head would probably not be appropriate for a department in need of calm, steady direction; a more cautious head would be better suited to provide such administration.

During an information gathering phase and well before I accepted the headship, I spoke to numerous colleagues in the profession. They were an excellent source of information and insight. They told me, for example, what the general perception was of the department as a whole and whether individual faculty members were perceived to have either contributed to the unit's ills or to have maintained a high degree of professionalism. Former graduate students were also a useful source of information; some of them had suffered the consequences of survival in the department's trenches during its worst years.

I attempted with some success to determine the department faculty members' teaching effectiveness and their scholarly reputation. I also requested documents such as the department's long-range plans, its promotion and tenure guidelines, its annual performance review guidelines, minutes from faculty meetings, and a recent university committee's evaluation of the unit. This and other information were essential to me in determining how sick the unit had been as well as the nature of the illness. The information gathered painted an overall bleak picture of the department during the past ten to fifteen years, yet at the same time I knew that I was fortunate in that many individual faculty members enjoyed fine reputations as scholars and teachers. Knowing this made easier my decision to accept the headship.

It was also helpful to know about the ratio of tenured to nontenured faculty members and how the former group may have influenced the department's collective behavior. My future department was top heavy with senior professors who had played a dominant role in determining the unit's policies, practices, and behaviors. It was thus important to ascertain how close certain individuals were to retirement and how much flexibility I was likely to have to make new hires on both a short-term and a long-term basis.

Faculty members with strong opinions and sometimes unpleasant, overbearing personalities are endemic to academic departments everywhere, but healthy units have learned to adapt and accommodate such individuals and their sometimes idiosyncratic behavior without letting them obstruct growth and progress. Unhealthy departments, on the other hand, have not learned to prevent these individuals from setting the unit's agenda, determining its course, and dominating its decision-making, including the hiring of new faculty. Unfortunately, my department fell into the latter category.

Fortunately, at the time I negotiated my department head contract, I was able to secure the administration's assurance that I would be given two new faculty lines and that I would be allowed to hire on all vacant lines. As a consequence, the department was able to hire six new assistant professors in four years. This infusion of new faculty members served to alter significantly the department's critical mass, a factor which made possible a change in the general atmosphere of personal and professional interactions. It also made collective decision-making considerably smoother. Initiatives such as undergraduate and graduate curricular reform were thus able to go forward after a few years.

Early on in my tenure as a new head, it was important for me to make contact with administrators, fellow department heads and program directors, and community leaders to hear what their perceptions were of the department and then to begin to dispel what was largely a negative image. It helped to establish links with other academic units on campus and to begin to cooperate on joint ventures ranging from sharing the expenses for outside speakers to planning for interdepartmental programmatic cooperation. Linkage with other administrators and non-departmental faculty members helped to identify myself as a person interested in the department's future and not its past. It also helped to create extradepartmental opportunities for the department's faculty members and students. Underlying my outreach activities was my strong belief that the sooner my department turned outward towards productive academic and professional pursuits the better off it would be. My hunch was that it had become increasingly isolated and turned in upon itself over the past decade, a position that encouraged stagnation and insularity and discouraged the initiation of exciting intellectual pursuits and projects across campus and in the community. My contact with key campus and community leaders also afforded me many opportunities to give positive progress reports, to brag about my department and its new image, and to garner support for its programs. Such contact helped to deal quickly and effectively with a seriously eroded credibility gap that had developed over the past decade. I found that after a couple years of intensive contact with administrators, students, faculty members on campus, community leaders, and colleagues elsewhere, the department began to shed its infamous reputation as a quarrelsome and fractious unit.

After almost a decade in academic administration, I am convinced that department heads and other administrators are often assigned a parental role by those with whom they work. This is especially the case in a dysfunctional unit where previous heads may have encouraged an unhealthy relationship of dependency between themselves and others in the department. Soon after starting my new position, I visited with a steady stream of faculty members, staff, and students, many of whom brought me complaints and real and imagined grievances involving colleagues or co-workers. While a few were serious and demanded my intervention, the majority of their complaints were suspiciously similar to those of sibling rivals in a large family. As they had probably done with my predecessors, department members were attempting again—albeit unconsciously—to assign me a surrogate role of a castigating parent upon whom they could call to punish an offender. I made a concerted effort to respond to such situations by emphasizing the importance of mature behavior. For example, I strongly and consistently encouraged faculty, staff, and students to deal directly with those against whom they had made a complaint in order to work out mutually satisfactory solutions. I considered it appropriate and helpful to teach healthy behaviors by modeling them in much the same manner that a counselor might model such behaviors to a group of teenage children in a dysfunctional family.

In the wide variety of interpersonal transactions in which I have been involved in my capacity as department head, I have found it comforting to refer to advice offered (facetiously, I'm sure) by a widely experienced administrator at an ADFL Summer Seminar for department heads a few years ago. I remember vividly the moment in his presentation he put down his prepared remarks, looked at us neophytes intently, and said, "If you want the secret to success as a department head, write down the title of *the* management book that's going to see you through thick and thin." We then dutifully jotted down the title of the department head's bible, the key to our success: *PET—Parent Effectiveness Training*. We all laughed as he then explained with mock seriousness that if one could successfully parent a rebellious two-year old child, one could certainly learn to deal with any angry, obstinate, or recalcitrant faculty member, staff, or student.

As humorous as the thought was at the time, the principles embodied in *PET*, the guidebook that has calmed the fears and frustrations of thousands of bewildered parents, have served me well over the years. I have found that in many cases individuals, rather than seeking a solution, simply want to experience being heard. The active listening techniques described in *PET* have been invaluable to me in these situations.

Another useful tenet of lay psychology revolves around the affirmation and rewarding of productive behavior, specifically the ways in which an individual has contributed to an overall sense of departmental cooperation and mutual respect. The corollary of this tenet is to ignore or at least to give little energy or recognition to behaviors that foster recrimination, suspicion, and distrust. For example, one faculty member had become accustomed to taunting others in faculty meetings, provoking them into reacting to his taunts, and thus transforming meetings into chaotic exchanges of insults. Obviously, very little productive discussion and decision-making went on in such meetings. As a new department head, I have tried to model a healthy and mature response to such taunting behavior by giving it little energy, that is, by not allowing my self to be hooked by the individual into his childlike game. I found that after a few meetings, he stopped the behavior simply because nobody was any longer reacting to it. 'Thus, positive, productive behavior was rewarded while negative, destructive behavior was ignored or at least not given undue attention. Faculty members thus learned that they could engage in intense discussion, disagree passionately, and yet not be inappropriate in their behavior toward each other.

New department heads sometimes fall into the trap of believing that they can, through their intervention, caring, and concern, change an emotionally troubled faculty member's personality. It is wise to leave such illusions behind as one begins to deal with difficult individuals who have had decades to develop their negative self-concept and warped view of the world. The best one can reasonably hope to achieve with such individuals is a modest degree of behavior modification so that they can begin to behave appropriately and productively in the work place. A realistic view of the human psyche has helped me distinguish between faculty members who need encouragement and support to become more professional and those who may suffer from some form of neurosis or even psychosis well beyond my control and expertise. I have regularly referred those who fall into the latter group to professional counselors on campus. (Most universities now maintain programs to assist faculty members, staff, and students to take care of their mental health needs.) While I have tried to remain compassionate and available to individuals who are obviously in need of support or a kind word, I have been very careful to avoid venturing into situations I was not professionally trained to handle.

Despite my best intentions, I found that after a few years of dealing day after day with a host of large and small problems and crises, I began to question my initial resolve as a department head. I also was suffering from some classic symptoms of stress including a short fuse and interrupted sleep patterns. I was plagued by doubts. Could I stay in the headship for the duration of my five-year term? Had the department made any real progress during the past few years? Were additional sacrifices of my own scholarship worth it? Did I really want to face going to the office day after day? Why had I done this to myself? Were those who had doubted my sanity years earlier right after all? Battle fatigue had clearly begun to take its toll. It was time to reassess, to develop a long-range strategy.

I offer the following suggestions to those who are themselves prospective or current heads of troubled departments.

1) Avoid falling into Manichaean traps. Leave easy divisions between good and evil to clergy and politicians. Remember that the best, most productive people in your department sometimes behave inappropriately and err in their judgment and that others, whom you may have dismissed as unprofessional and unproductive, can change. Be open in your perceptions of others.

2) Do frequent reality checks. Are you losing your objectivity? Have you, too, become infected by the collective pathology of the department with which you have tried to contend?

3) Maintain a proper balance between your administrative responsibilities and priorities and your own scholarship. For professional as well as intellectual reasons, it is essential to remain current in your field. Although it may not be practical to plan to finish a monographic study, it is important to continue to read, give conference papers, and publish.

4) Monitor your health and take good care of yourself by taking vacations and shorter breaks and by maintaining a regular recreational schedule. An administrator's life is highly structured with endless meetings and other commitments. It has been important for me to put into my work week unstructured time and to vary, whenever possible, the routine of a ten to twelve-hour day. I frequently schedule working days at home to write reports, prepare my class, and occasionally read in my field. While I am available by phone to deal with crises or answer urgent questions, I have at least changed the physical work setting, allowing myself to return refreshed to the office the next day with a sense of accomplishment. Relatively uninterrupted time for research and writing has given me an incentive to commit myself to department administration over a long period. Oh, yes. I forgot to mention that at home the microwave and the refrigerator are only a few steps away.

5) Don't take yourself too seriously. Maintain your sense of humor. Try to keep your ego out of the daily transactions with deans, faculty members, staff, and students. Introduce some levity into personal transactions and departmental meetings, but rigorously avoid sarcasm and offhand comments that might be offensive to others. I dress up in disguises on Halloween as a way of modeling a healthy sense of humor. The office staff and most faculty and students seem to respond positively; others, however, are probably confirmed in what they had suspected all along: that I have gone off the deep end.

6) Avoid developing a messianic complex. You are not the only one who is equipped to do the department's essential work. Share responsibility judiciously with colleagues on whom you can rely. Let them know that you both trust and depend on them to follow through with their commitments. Emphasize to the faculty as a whole that they have a collective responsibility and role in the

ultimate success or failure of the department's goals and mission. Remember, you as a department head can facilitate a process that will allow them to achieve their collective goals, but you can't do it without their help.

7) Don't try to write the perfect memo. Meet essential deadlines and complete the important tasks that keep the department running from semester to semester, but keep in mind that you can't physically deal with all the requests and demands that come across your desk. Learn to prioritize your tasks.

8) Finally, don't become wedded to the position of the headship. It is immensely comforting knowing that my sense of self-worth is not tied to the position. Learn to recognize when you have overstayed your visit, when you are becoming part of the problem and not part of the solution. If you find yourself becoming increasingly irritated and resentful, systematically avoiding contact with faculty and students, and coming to the office later and leaving earlier, it's probably time to tell the dean you're ready to move back into a regular faculty position.

Wouldn't that be nice? All you have to worry about is teaching your classes, mentoring your students, writing your book, and . . . and dealing with the new department head who wants you to chair a search committee, start a fund drive, revamp the graduate curriculum. . . . Good luck!

CHAPTER 14

Chairing the Small Department: Or When You're the Only One

Carol Ebersol Klein
Beaver College

A "small" department can range from one person who teaches all foreign language classes in a small college to one person who supervises a few other instructors, usually offering more than one foreign language. My situation is another alternative: I am the only tenure-track person who chairs eight to ten adjunct instructors. Taken seriously, the chairmanship of a small department is at best difficult and time-consuming, and it often brings few immediate rewards. Nevertheless, it can be a tremendously rewarding experience to interact with others in your field and, often more importantly, with people in other academic areas. If only for survival, you have to be able to work efficiently, get the most out of people with the least effort possible, and collaborate with faculty in other departments in order to form important alliances for college issues. What follows are general principles that I have established and examples from my own experience that can be useful for other chairs of small departments to help make the job rewarding and fun. Yes, fun; maintaining a sense of humor and not taking yourself too seriously are among the basic requirements for survival!

Generally speaking, chairs of departments of up to five full-time members have the same functions as those of larger departments. Frequently, however, the college administration assumes that because we have fewer people to supervise, we have less work and therefore require less college support. It is not uncommon for the chair to carry a standard teaching load and to earn little or no additional salary for additional administrative duties. The areas of responsibility are numerous, and the detail work is endless. If we're not careful, we can be overwhelmed and feel overburdened. At my college, for example, in addition to teaching a full three-course load per semester, my administrative responsibilities include scheduling and supervising of instruction in Spanish, French, German, Italian, and Japanese; authority for the departmental budget; representation on college committees, particularly pertaining to international issues; recommendations for hiring and reappointments, including salary increments; record keeping and correspondence; adult and student staff supervision; curricular initiatives; coordination of auxiliary units (language laboratory, foreign study programs, honor societies, clubs, etc.); development, scheduling, and grading of placement examinations; student advising; textbook and library orders; and preparation of departmental annual reports.

To a certain extent, smaller departments are easier to manage because we have fewer people to deal with, but unfortunately, much of the reporting and administrative tasks are the same, regardless of numbers. The main problem is that you wind up doing all of the work yourself, whereas in larger departments you can rely on staff and colleagues to share tasks. At Beaver College, since the faculty secretary serves six departments in addition to other duties for the administration, chairs do all of their non-routine work and handle calls and correspondence. It is common in small colleges, particularly, to have a division secretary who can be counted on for some, but surely not all, correspondence and paperwork.

It's a juggling act, at best. For most faculty, teaching and research are enough to keep them busy. In addition, chairs of small departments have few people to share the administrative load. How can they possibly manage to accomplish these things and in addition be effective department chairs? It can be an enjoyable challenge or an unsurmountable burden, depending on how one approaches the situation.

Upon assuming the chair at Beaver College, I realized that I could very easily spend all my time doing administrative and teaching duties, with no time left for writing and research, let alone a personal life. I determined from the beginning that it would be unacceptable and unwise to fall into that trap. So, I decided to identify the most important aspects of the job, work on those, and hope that the others would get adequate attention. Chairs have lots of things going at once, and we cannot get totally engrossed in any one single item. Furthermore, there are fewer disappointments when we realize from the beginning that not everybody works at our own pace and that work habits run the gamut from the methodical plodder to the absent-minded scholar. Some people are self-starters who can be left alone to do their work, while others require specific directions and frequent feedback. My past experiences working in a variety of academic and non-academic settings have heightened my natural fascination with people. For me, in fact, this is one of the most intriguing aspects of being chair; it keeps me constantly alert to people's needs and forces me to be creative in working with them. Furthermore, keeping a fresh outlook toward people outweighs the occasional frustrations that seem to be endemic in academia these days.

Effective chairs of small departments first keep in mind a set of theoretical principles and then base their day-to-day operations on them. If you can keep your eye on what you determine as your guiding principles instead of being driven by worry about paperwork and administrative details, you'll be able to maintain equilibrium. First, see your role as a facilitator for departmental activity. You'll get more mileage out of your people if they feel part of the action and can own decisions. Start by deciding as a group where you want your department to be in, let's say, the next five years. and work toward that goal. Don't be afraid to dream. Naturally, there are always systematic, historical, financial, and personnel considerations, but one needs a road map. At Beaver College, we determined to make foreign languages more visible, and every initiative is related to that goal. We are providing top-notch instruction, more interesting courses for a variety of audiences, day and evening classes, and encouragement for overseas study. We're not where we want to be yet, but we keep plugging away, and so far everyone is energetically working toward our goal.

We need a proactive focus: identifying things we can do something about and diverting time and energy toward them. You won't get bogged down in thinking about what can't be or what your political foes might be cooking up, because you don't have time to waste on things you can do nothing about. We can't fret about poorly prepared students, inadequate computer facilities, or an unsuitable general education curriculum. Instead, we need to concentrate our efforts on working as well as possible with what we have and going through the necessary channels to improve existing conditions. This takes time and energy, but it's focused activity and will ultimately produce results.

Effective leadership entails creative thinking and vision, in other words, looking at and sizing up a situation and asking how to deal with it. At Beaver, we have been stymied by the low enrollments in upper division foreign language classes and have to imagine ways to change this. If only this situation were based solely on instructional method, we would have easy solutions, but it is a much more complex campus issue. Our adjunct faculty cannot understand what is happening, since they are on campus for limited hours and rarely have access to faculty or student forums. This situation puts more responsibility on the chair to communicate with adjuncts with regard to policies and concerns and to encourage their involvement in campus discussions and activities.

Department chairs who are effective managers give colleagues license to think and establish their schedule and work habits. Naturally, instructional quality is very important, but individual instructors should be left to devise methods that are the most effective for them. The chair should outline the thrust of departmental instruction, particularly to new faculty, but it is not necessary to make constant checks on individual faculty unless there are obvious problems. At Beaver several people will teach multiple sections of one course. Instead of telling them how to proceed, I ask the people teaching the same section of a course to get together to determine guidelines, material to cover, and general focus. When they send me their course syllabus, I can see how they have collaborated. As chairs, we need to ask questions, give options, share opinions, and be flexible. The cooperative interaction of a department is proof of effective management.

Chairs communicate with the dean on behalf of their department for purposes of personnel matters, money, equipment, and other special requests. Therefore, we have to make clear what the expectations are for each faculty member and the parameters of their duties. At the same time, we need to know how we can compensate them for extra responsibilities and encourage them to be professionally active. To do this effectively, the chair has to appreciate the initiative of individual members and be willing to fight for their due reward. Recently, when a department member concerned with the low profile of foreign languages at Beaver asked if he could establish a French Club, I immediately broached the subject with the dean and requested special monies for the project. Similarly, last year another member volunteered to supervise computer instruction in the department, and, at my request, the dean provided her the necessary means to carry out these duties. This is often a negotiating process and can be awkward, but active department members who can count on their chair to support them will be willing to take risks and will be much more effective than those who are merely told to do things and expected to carry out their duties pro forma.

Chairs should be honest with department members. By all means, praise faculty for good student evaluations, but if performance is off, discuss the matter frankly, trying to provide guidelines for change. If the nature of the position is tentative, as is the case with adjuncts, this fact should be made clear. If you cannot promise specific courses, say that; make a preliminary schedule and give a reasonable date by which classes should be determined. Be prepared for faculty dissatisfaction related to course cancellations, but if you have done the proper preliminary work, you should not worry about faculty complaints.

Time management is essential, and you need to put first things first. If you're not careful, just the mail and other paperwork alone can cause you anxiety. One look at all of these reports and questionnaires, meetings, campus events, grant initiatives, etc., leaves you wondering how you can ever be caught up. The truth is that you will undoubtedly always have unfinished business, and you'll just have to get used to that fact. But there are several options for dealing with this situation. One choice is to work yourself into a frenzy doing urgent matters. These usually consist of deadline-driven projects, pressing matters, mail and calls, and reacting to crises. All of these entail reacting to situations that come up. People who spend all their time putting out fires, so to speak, are very stressed and quickly burned out. They can feel victimized by a cumbersome system as they react to priorities set by others. This short-term focus means that in essence they are out of control, very unhappy, and probably ineffective chairs.

Another choice is to turn your energy toward making things happen. This approach reflects the proactive focus you've already established and means that you control what is important instead of constantly reacting to others' mandates. You'll be surprised to find that you can have reasonable peace of mind if you concentrate on building relationships, seeking new opportunities, and planning for the future. This is not to sound naive; everybody would want to be chair if all he or she had to do was to sit around all day and think and imagine new possibilities. Naturally, we have to deal with crises and urgent situations, but if we're putting important things first, the number of items that require our immediate attention will be reasonably small in comparison. Preplanning and prevention will help stave off emergencies. The key is balance and discipline to keep looking at the big picture and not to get bogged down with the trivia that trap you and starve you of energy to be creative.

The chair of a small department wants to get the most done as efficiently as possible. Most of the issues you face are people-related, so you want them to feel good about themselves. Praise them for jobs well done; a note or call of thanks to recognize someone for going beyond the call of duty will go a long way to make a person feel part of the team. Even sometimes difficult people feel proud of being given a designated title when they are responsible for a particular operation or event.

With only a few people in a department, you cannot afford to have ill feelings or animosity, since you need as many hands as possible to do the work of the department. If you're careful from the beginning to establish respect for department members, you'll be more likely to prevent personnel crises later. But on the other hand, you cannot spend all your time holding people's hands, so you will want to devise some workable systems for members to report to you in order to get feedback without wasting too much time. This effort involves some up-front time at the beginning of each semester in order to get things organized, but that time is well spent.

Automatically assume that the first two weeks of the semester will not be yours, because you will be dealing with a series of problems, ranging from book orders, classroom changes, last-minute extra sections of courses or cancellations, placement testing, the language laboratory, student help, equipment, etc. You might get your department together socially at the beginning and/or end of the semester so people get to know who their colleagues are, and then most subsequent communications will probably be in forms of memos, phone calls, and small group meetings. Don't skip this part of the job, using the excuse that nobody had time for extra events, because a workable *esprit de corps* makes life easier and more pleasant for everyone.

Adjuncts either present special problems or prove to be unusually delightful colleagues. They are underpaid and are exploited by the institution. Many would prefer a full-time position, but for personal and professional reasons, that option is not in the cards. In a metropolitan area, it is usually very easy to find well-qualified adjuncts, but it takes time to replace people when there's a high turnover. If they are good, you want to try to keep them, and this will mean that you'll want to go to bat for them. Having adjuncts is a lot of work for chairs, because you often wind up taking the role of a TA director, particularly for new people, and this task can be very time consuming. My experience has been that they are usually very loyal and cooperative colleagues as long as you see to it that the college provides office space, phone access, mail service, and the ordinary creature comforts for regular faculty. It's been my policy not to ask them to do more than teach their classes and hold office hours unless they are compensated financially for extra duties. And they should know from the onset that their position is tentative, depending on enrollment. The advantages to you of having adjuncts are first of all that some very interesting and stimulating people form part of the department, and since most are not on a standard career path, they more than likely bring a certain freshness to the job that more seasoned instructors often lack. Also, you can demand top performance, and if they don't measure up, you just don't hire them back.

It is important for the chair to be available for faculty and students on a regular basis. Unless it is stipulated by your faculty statutes—and I have yet to see this—chairs aren't glued to their office chairs all day every day. Set reasonable office hours and communicate them to your faculty and students. When you're not on duty, make time for your own work and refuse interruptions. If you need to be in your office, close the door and let the answering machine or faculty secretary take your calls, or work elsewhere, such as in the library or at home for blocks of time.

Departments are part of the college or university, and your job is not just to chair your own department in a vacuum. In the larger sense, as chair, you represent the department on your campus, and you need to pay close attention to building relationships with other departments and the administration. It is easy to be so engrossed in departmental issues that you don't stick your head out of your office door. Sometimes you feel so busy that it seems like wasted time to chat with colleagues or the dean's secretary. But you'll pay later for your shortsightedness when you're seeking support for something related to your department, such as new course approvals, foreign language requirements, or interdisciplinary general education courses. Mingle with a variety of people, eat lunch in the cafeteria, have coffee with colleagues, or talk casually in the parking lot so that people get to know you as a person on whom they can count.

Keep fighting for what you believe, and don't give up. Put your efforts into things you can control, develop a thick skin, and maintain a sense of humor. Don't stew over the dean's unwillingness to budge on a topic dear to your heart or over the poor quality of undergraduate preparation. It can be discouraging to have to defend your every move, but if that's what it takes on your campus, just accept it as part of the territory. Defeatists are dominated by their environment, whereas proactive people are in control and exercise their freedom to choose their path of action.

After all, this is only a job; it is not a life commitment. As a small department chair you won't be bored, you won't want for things to do, and you won't get stale. You can count on new things to intrigue you: people react in unexpected ways, enrollments soar or dip surprisingly, tight money brings hard choices, and campus issues can take their toll on faculty morale. At first, expect to be on a learning curve, but as soon as you have defined your overall principles so you can act on important matters of your own choosing, you will find that being chair of a small department has intrinsic merit, albeit little related to financial reward or campus status.

CHAPTER 15

Purpose and Function of Professional Associations and Meetings: Networking

---

Raymond Gay-Crosier
University of Florida

One of the least understood responsibilities of faculty members is regular attendance at professional meetings. The public at large, alarmed by some legislator's campaign against "waste of tax dollars" or "lack of production," frequently associates those meetings with abuse of public trust. This common view is reinforced when local county or city officials, congresspersons, or senators are taking part in increasingly scrutinized meetings or junket trips, often taking place in distant, not to say exotic, locations. Suspicion turns into righteous anger when investigative reporters in series such as ABC's *Prime Time* (June 18, 1992) correlate luxurious cruises taken by doctors and their families with overpriced drugs that sick people can barely afford. Small wonder, then, that in the prevailing mood of public distrust, "professional" trips of all kinds are lumped together and seen as unnecessary frills disguised as job-related necessity. Even some campus administrators, responding to the pressures of accountability, tend in lean years to consider professional travel as a non- or less-essential activity likely to be among the first budget items sacrificed. The purpose of this chapter is to contribute to a better understanding of the necessity of professional travel both for faculty members' intellectual and scientific growth and for institutions' standing and recognition.

Clearly, faculty members and institutions have to do a better job of informing the public of the more than symbolic importance of professional meetings. Professional associations are far more than mutual admiration societies. Their function, range of influence, and importance vary widely and often are not readily evident even to persons conversant with the system. It is often assumed that the geographic area covered reflects an ascending level of significance because of the presumed breadth of the net that is cast. Local professional groups hardly exist outside the fields of medicine, technology, and primary or secondary education. Foreign language scholars are usually members of regional, national, and international associations.

But these designations are of a generic rather than qualitative nature. It is quite possible to organize or participate in a significant (i.e., refereed) international meeting on one's local campus. Conversely, in this age of academic jet-setting, gatherings of limited or questionable scholarly importance held in attractive albeit distant locations can be and are presented, often in glossy programs, as national or international conferences. Most difficult to judge are highly specialized meetings whose number has mushroomed because of the fragmentation of disciplines and subdisciplines. The presence of leading scholars reading papers or organizing sections is not only reassuring but also a sign that a colleague's attendance contributes to the improvement of the department's and his/her own academic network.

Without a doubt, a presentation made at a regional meeting can be of higher intellectual caliber than some vague participation in a round table at a national conference. Still, regional meetings such as SAMLA, SCOLT, etc., often play a somewhat different role in the sense that they function as an important annual information clearing agency. While similar exchanges also take place at national meetings, such as those held by the MLA, the more closely shared geographic and socio-economic environment allows participants in regional meetings to compare notes among sister institutions with similar problems and program objectives. Still, in assessing the importance, not to say legitimacy, of a colleague's subsidized attendance at a professional meeting, department chairs should base their decision primarily upon the *intrinsic value* of the proposed activity and suppress, at least initially, its public relations effect. Therefore, a proposal to attend an international meeting of limited scholarly importance should be given a low priority or turned down.

Department chairs know that, especially over the last decade, doctoral students in their Ph.D. programs, many of them prospective college teachers, demand and receive (or should receive) preparation and assistance for their life in the "real world," i.e., their profession. Conversely, applicants for tenure-track junior faculty positions display a steadily more sophisticated, occasionally exaggerated, horizon of professional expectation. This trend comes at a time when the public, especially undergraduates and their parents, demands a greater focus on quality teaching and job placement. Seemingly contradictory, both trends reflect equally justifiable goals.

On one hand, the pedagogy of higher learning remains a relatively uncultivated field that rarely produces more than some hands-on orientation given to incoming graduate teaching assistants. By and large, students continue to take their cues from their most inspiring university teachers, whom they attempt to emulate. Most of the time spent in a doctoral curriculum has to be devoted to the acquisition of highly specialized knowledge. On the other hand, graduate institutions and professional schools (including liberal arts colleges which are their feeders) have become a keenly competitive educational "industry" whose products, i.e., the knowledge they develop and transmit and the students they graduate, have to compete successfully in the international world of science, business, and the professions. Because that world depends on affordability, efficiency, and tangible results, management principles adopted by universities tend to follow the corporate model. This means that for faculty members and the institution to which they belong, "success" is measured with an ever more demanding yardstick.

It is readily understood that to teach at the university level, all faculty members must remain current in their fields. In addition, everybody takes for granted that the business of a university is not only to impart existing knowledge but to refine and expand it; hence, the premium attached to research. Junior and senior faculty members alike are, therefore, facing a career of complex, occasionally conflicting and changing, demands from many sides: the students want more attention paid to their individual problems, whether educational or personal. In addition to education, parents expect that their children will receive training for a particular job. The profession, through its associations and meetings, provides forums for the advancement of knowledge and the basis of the peer group judgment by which most faculty members establish their standing and reputation in the field. Finally, institutional senior peers, i.e., tenured faculty members and university administrators, collate all the reports on candidates' pedagogical and scholarly achievements to determine not only their salary increases but also their career advancement, through tenure and/or promotion. What do relations with professional associations and professional travel have to do with all this? A great deal.

The guiding principle at work is the interaction between the elements that constitute professional success. Good teaching, currency in the field, productive research, advancement of knowledge, graduation and placement of students (whether in competitive graduate programs or the job market) contribute to a university's reputation which, in turn, depends primarily on its faculty's reputation. It has been argued (see, e.g., the 1992 May-June issues of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*) that teaching should be separated from research because too many professors allegedly "hide" behind their research and neglect good teaching. It goes without saying that, especially at universities, teaching and research remain inextricably linked. All teachers must constantly update their knowledge lest they be caught recycling outdated material. The question is one of dosage, not "either teaching or research" but how much of each.

It is the responsibility of the administrator (in most cases, the chair) to assign departmental tasks to each colleague in such a way as to maximize his/her display of particular talent, i.e., efficiency. For some, this might mean periodically writing a book or articles in leading journals, or developing scientific breakthroughs, new techniques or new products for the industry. For others, it could be writing an occasional article in a respectable journal or refining an existing scientific or technical procedure while concentrating their efforts on good teaching of larger classes. The first group is more likely to find a responsive level of discourse among a smaller set of future peers such as graduate students or undergraduate majors. The latter group might be more adept at reaching a larger audience of undergraduates. But even just to stay current in the field does not mean passively to register its output by reading selected publications only. Knowledge is dynamic, not static. It is shaped and reshaped through shared discourse. Participation in the professional dialogue, whether in its written or oral form, is, therefore, a necessity even for the instructor who wishes mainly to remain current. Currency and expansion of knowledge in a field in fact overlap at the proverbial cutting edge. Both the university and the faculty member have a mandate to be at least cognizant of this cutting edge and, in appropriate cases, to contribute to its articulation.

Interaction at different levels chosen in accordance with one's predispositions and abilities explains the paramount importance of the *professional network*. The purpose of any type of network is to facilitate the transfer of information, i.e., communication. A first condition to successful and productive networking is to be properly plugged in. Institutions of higher learning with their academic, fiscal, and administrative responsibilities and the numerous local, regional, national, and international professional associations are linked by macro- and micro-networks all of which ultimately feed each other. Every network acts as a layer of precisely defined activities whose quality is assessed by in-field experts with a proven level of achievement or knowledge.

Experience shows that allocation of competitive travel funds is best handled by the chair and not through committees. Criteria governing the selection process should be discussed and presented in the context of a department's chosen mission. The following examples represent typical cases which a faculty member and department chair (or dean, if the allocation of travel funds is made at college level) might encounter.

Let us assume that a unit of 20 faculty members is given a specific amount, say $4,000, earmarked for travel funds by the dean's office. The manner in which this amount is distributed reflects in many ways the department's and—to some extent—the university's style of governance and general culture. Like other administrative dictates, travel policies and not the amount allocated are an indicator of the degree of institutional maturity. The more restrictive, uninspired, and uninspiring these policies are, the less likely it is that the unit or, possibly, the university belongs to a leading group of programs or institutions.

The easy way. Lester Drummond, department chair at a land grant university where salaries have been notoriously lagging, is besieged by budget problems on all fronts. To keep the peace, he will simply divide the amount among all his colleagues, including himself, and allocate a $200 travel allowance to each. After all, he rationalizes, proportionate distribution of scarce funds has the advantage of treating everybody equally in terms of travel opportunity. Two hundred dollars will either cover a major portion of a low-priced air fare to a national meeting or enable a colleague to drive to a regional meeting and thus compensate for his/her accommodations. Whether his colleagues read a paper or not, whether they function as elected officers at the meeting or not, matters less than the fact that everybody has an opportunity to attend a professional meeting. On the surface, this egalitarian scheme makes sense, because nobody is deprived of the opportunity to attend a meeting and to "enrich" him/herself. But in reality it penalizes those participants who make a significant contribution to their profession by either reading a paper or acting as elected officers or section organizers.

For example, Assistant Professor Susan Brodsky, who is presenting a distilled version of the results of her sabbatical research, has to pay $580 out of her pocket to attend a national meeting on the West Coast because the cheapest ticket costs nearly $500 and hotels are expensive. Her paper is one of three chosen among fifteen submitted. Since she will be coming up for tenure in two years, her success at a national meeting is a professional opportunity that she does not have the luxury to decline. On the other end of the scale, Associate Professor Peter Stryker, who has worked for ten years on a book whose first chapter has yet to take shape uses his $200 to pay for meals and a hotel at a regional meeting, to which he drives in his own car. Bored by the second paper he hears, he escapes to the hallways hoping to run into an old friend. They meet indeed, promptly settle in a coffee shop where they devise their evening program which includes dinner and a play at a downtown theater. Missing the urban lifestyle to which he was accustomed until he moved to a small college town, Stryker decides to catch up by spending most of his daytime strolling and shopping in a fashionable district. He manages to catch the tail end of the paper read by a colleague in his department before heading home for an early evening arrival.

These are obviously fictitious examples whose composite nature nevertheless comes close enough to reality. Obviously, all kinds of variations are possible between these two extremes. They demonstrate, however, that the egalitarian distribution scheme risks penalizing and rewarding the wrong persons.

The autocratic way. Pursuing an ambitious agenda geared to propel his department to national visibility within five years, Hal Elliott appropriates every dollar of his meager departmental budget in terms of this goal. While the dean's office will not allow him to use travel funds for any other purpose—a sign of a short leash that indicates insecurity on the part of the dean, unless state statutes are behind the restriction—he has a free hand as far as the mode and amount of allocation are involved.

Professor Carol Sheeny, an internationally recognized medievalist, has been invited to participate in a round table of leading specialists to be held in Italy. Unfortunately, the invitation came too late to buy a reduced ticket or to shop for other funding sources. In fact, her ticket will be very expensive because she has to be back for the mid-term examinations and can stay only two days at the conference. Her ticket plus a modest per diem amount to $1,350, and she claims to be financially unable to commit significant funds of her own. Seven other faculty members in this department of 20 active scholars have legitimate requests for a travel subsidy, including a second trip with an international destination: Associate Professor Heidi Truax, who has had limited international exposure and expects to be considered for promotion the following year, is scheduled to read a paper at a conference in London. She was able to secure $300 from another source on campus. Even with a reduced air fare, her total package costs the department $850, i.e., $1,150 minus $300. The six remaining prospective travelers, all of whom wish to read papers or act as officers at regional and national meetings, request a combined subsidy of $3,700. This means that the $5,900 total cost of travel requests exceeds the allocation by $1,900. Believing that international exposure contributes significantly to the wider recognition the department must achieve, Elliott decides to finance the international trips fully and to allocate $300 each to the other seven travelers, thus covering about half the cost of each individual.

Apart from the glaring inequity, this approach indicates an oversimplified generalization of the impact that participation in international meetings might have on a department's reputation. Conversely, it makes professional trips to legitimate national or regional meetings difficult or, in some cases, impossible. It also underestimates the influence on the manner in which regional and national reputations and ratings of departments are achieved. As a result of his action, Elliott will gain no significant improvement in his department's reputation and will encounter considerable dissatisfaction among his colleagues. At the very least, and keeping in mind the record of past allocations, he should have asked several of his colleagues, especially the international travelers, to stress the importance they attribute to the meetings they wished to attend by a personal commitment of money.

A reasonable compromise. As a widely published and recognized specialist in Spanish linguistics, Rosemary Kowalski knows how instrumental participation in professional meetings is for both a faculty member's scholarly development and a department's visibility. Having been appointed chair of a unit of 20 faculty members, of which approximately eight to ten are active conference participants in any given year, she realizes that distributing $4,000 in travel funds requires something other than an attempt to keep everybody content. At the beginning of her administrative tenure, she instituted a system whereby she could obtain information on colleagues' travel plans every year before announcing even tentative travel allocations. All colleagues were asked to submit a list of professional travel plans, including a realistic cost estimate. They also had to prioritize their trips if more than one was planned. As much supportive material as possible had to be provided, if and when available: pre-programs, programs, letters of invitation, solicitations of papers, descriptions of selection modalities, etc. The more solid a travel proposal, the greater the chance that it would receive a high departmental priority.

The effect of such a system was twofold:

1) Quantitatively, it provided Kowalski with the approximate total amount that an inflated "ideal" budget would require if every trip listed were to be subsidized; more importantly, it helped her prepare an informal request for the following year's travel budget which asked for a $5,000 allocation, still below the basic amount that a competitive department would need;

2) Qualitatively, the list with attached supportive material gave her an indication of the kinds and caliber of meetings in which her colleagues intended to be active.

With her own broad experience and knowledge of the national and international conference scene, she was thus able to make more judicious decisions. Of equal if not greater importance, however, was the fact that by collating these data her colleagues subjected their desiderata to a necessary process of self-evaluation while realizing and measuring the impact of the cost of each meeting. This consciousness-raising exercise also predisposed her colleagues in a more participatory way to accept the decisions she was appointed to make and to discuss the possibility of cost sharing.

Of the four international trips proposed, she accepted two as legitimate top priorities because the meetings presented a demonstrable high caliber of participants. One international conference organizer had already contracted with a major editor to publish a select number of papers, including the contribution of Kowalski's colleague. Both international travelers obtained partial outside funding, one from an on-campus agency, the other from the conference organizers. Still, she allocated only $550 to one and $650 to the other, asking both to make up the difference of $250 and $300 respectively, which they did. The remaining budget balance of $2,800 was distributed as follows to the seven other travelers: $200 each for two colleagues who either read a paper or were section organizers at a regional meeting to which they drove with their own cars; $600 to an assistant professor who was making his first presentation at a prestigious national meeting known for its exceptionally competitive selection of papers; $500 each for three participants (including herself) reading papers or acting as section chairs at national meetings of their respective professional associations. She and another colleague had to contribute $250 and $200 respectively to cover their costs. Finally, one colleague received $300 to attend a national meeting at which he was elected section secretary. He decided to attend the meeting in spite of the fact that his cost sharing amounted to $350.

Tedious as they sound, these examples are typical of an ambitious department that attempts to balance the need to participate *actively* in professional meetings, the institution's academic mission, the perennial lack of adequate funds, faculty members' career objectives, and their willingness yet limited ability to invest their own funds in this type of professional venture. What emerges from these case studies (or any variation thereof) is the necessity to gather and compare all facts, to consider individual and institutional interests and objectives, and to balance all factors carefully in the decision-making process.

Cost sharing by faculty is a thorny issue in a profession that remains notoriously at the low end of the academic salary scale. It is the department chair's primary responsibility to undertake, year after year, whatever she or he can to improve the travel budget. In mature institutions, departments receive lump sums for their entire expense budget rather than amounts earmarked for specific expenditures. In these cases, a chair should use maximum administrative imagination in order to stretch the travel budget, including—if authorized to do so—the conversion of amounts from other budget categories. Because participation in reputable professional meetings is an intellectual and institutional necessity, attending at least some select conferences is not a matter of choice but one of obligation for both the faculty member and the department striving for quality and recognition. It is the aggregate interaction at, and the cumulative resonance from, stimulating conferences, including the numerous professional contacts of individual faculty members, that ultimately constitute the professional networks.

Individually and collectively, the academic and professional networks act as major catalysts in the formation of judgments in key areas:

1) Whether transparent or opaque, these networks remain the major sources of professional recognition for the individual as well as for the academic unit;

2) Central administrations of universities in turn form their own value judgment on individual faculty members and departments by relying on the information they gather from appropriate professional networks (or from rating systems that rely on these networks);

3) By virtue of their ability to help establish a good reputation, professional networks initially have a direct impact on the quality and quantity of applicants for a particular undergraduate or graduate program and, eventually, on these programs' record in job placement.

Networking, therefore, is as essential to a faculty member's personal and professional success as it is to his/her unit's recognition as a high quality academic program.

Because departments and their members have a vested interest in building a strong network, cost sharing for some professional trips might become a necessity. While the primary responsibility for facilitating professional development remains with the institution, in times of tight budgets, cost sharing might be the only way to enable a faculty member to participate in a particular meeting. As always, a careful assessment of a conference's significance is necessary before making a decision. In and by itself, a faculty member's readiness to share in costs is not necessarily the decisive factor, although it will always remain a strong one in the decision-making process. Department chairs have the responsibility to convey to faculty members all elements that inform their decisions, affirmative or negative. Periodically they also must inform their colleagues of alternative sources of funding that should be tapped before travel requests are submitted.

Proper allocation of limited travel resources is more than a fiscal management problem: it is a building block in the establishment of a department's and an institution's reputation and a key element in maintaining faculty morale.

CHAPTER 16

Legal Issues: Employment Discrimination, Sexual and Racial Harassment

---

Phyllis Zatlin
Rutgers University

The scene is easy to imagine. The tenured colleagues are debating their hiring needs: Should we advertise for a medievalist or a specialist in Renaissance poetry? "What we really need," says a former chair, "is a lawyer." "And a resident psychologist," thinks the embattled current chair, who begins to doodle directional signs for the hall: Grievances to the left. Lawsuits to the right.

Comparatively speaking, it is easy to identify equal opportunity/ affirmative action principles, more difficult to get everyone's cooperation in putting appropriate policies in place, and virtually impossible to keep your department continuously out of conflict. New chairs who inherit departments that have not already met affirmative action goals—in spirit as well as in number—or that have not developed procedures to avoid problems stemming from real or perceived discrimination may need all the legal and counseling help they can find, both for themselves and for their colleagues.

Twenty years ago, many leaders in higher education were stunned by the extension of equal opportunity laws to colleges and universities and by the imposition of affirmative action programs for federal contractors. They lamented the anticipated demise of the "meritocracy." Today we have learned from experience that equal opportunity measures not only are the right thing to do but that they make administrative good sense. Such procedures as conducting open searches, carefully defining criteria for employment and promotion, and eliminating personal prejudice from the decision-making process cannot help but strengthen a department. The implementation of these principles, however, can at times prove exasperating and stressful.

One of the key requirements of affirmative action programs relates to recruitment: job openings should be widely publicized in order to achieve a representative applicant pool, one that includes minorities and women in proportion to their availability for the particular position. In our field, the *MLA Job Information List* is an effective recruitment mechanism. Some institutions may require departments to do additional advertising and mailings, but the MLA lists by themselves will generally give excellent results.

Job vacancy notices should obviously be non-discriminatory. Positions may not be limited to native speakers of a language because such a requirement denies equal opportunity on the basis of national origin. Similarly, a position in Chicano literature may not be restricted to Chicano applicants. Rather, descriptions should define the specialty or skill needed (e.g., near-native fluency, research record in the field).

All applicants should be carefully evaluated in relation to the job description. In our department, we have developed a cover sheet on which each search committee member records his/her comments on such relevant matters as degree status, teaching experience, area of specialization, research in progress, and letters of recommendation. The method eliminates potential subjectivity and provides a written record of the decision-making process. (Since we keep the annotated applications on file for two years, they also may provide a helpful source of candidates for last-minute or temporary vacancies.)

Ideally the selection process should be blind to such matters as race, sex, and national origin, but departments that have a past pattern of discrimination are suspect if their recruitment efforts invariably perpetuate a non-representative faculty. In the field of modern languages, where women hold 60% of recent doctorates, it would be a challenging task indeed to justify an all-male department. In Spanish, where there is a significant presence of Hispanics, one would anticipate that the faculty in all but the smallest departments would include both native speakers of English and of Spanish and that the latter group would represent diverse national origins. For other languages, the availability of minority faculty is, in fact, discouragingly low. Bettina J. Huber has argued persuasively that we should take affirmative action to increase the percentage of minority students in our undergraduate and graduate programs in order to achieve a more diversified faculty in the future. In the meantime, however, departments without minority representation may wish to rethink their job descriptions. For example, perhaps what is really needed is not a specialist in Renaissance poetry but one in Francophone literature: not only is minority availability, doubtless higher in the latter subfield, but the new courses to be taught by the successful candidate may attract more minority students to the study of French.[1]

Those involved in interviewing candidates, at the MLA convention and on campus, must be carefully instructed in advance to avoid discriminatory questions. The ADFL pre-convention workshop provides helpful suggestions, but they will only be effective if everyone on the search committee is aware of them. Since 1972, when Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was amended to include higher education, colleges and universities have been covered by federal legislation prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, and national origin. Subsequent federal and state laws have added other categories, such as ancestry, age, physical or mental handicap, veteran's or marital status.[2] Five states and the District of Columbia also have statutes outlawing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.[3] The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) includes among unlawful pre-employment inquiries questions relating to all of the above categories, as well as to pregnancy, future childbearing plans, number and age of children, U.S. citizenship, union affiliation, history of illnesses, and date of birth.[4]

The easiest way to avoid the myriad of taboo subjects is to develop a set of relevant, job-related interview questions and ask them, evenhandedly, of all candidates. For example, if the position requires directing a study abroad program each spring, you may legitimately ask candidates if they anticipate any difficulty assuming this responsibility. It would obviously be illegal to ask candidates anything specific about spouses or children or their own health.

Although some equal opportunity guidelines suggest that certain questions cease to be discriminatory if they are asked of all candidates, both male and female, I strongly recommend against using them. How will the individual candidate know that an otherwise illegal question has now become acceptable? And might not the implications of the same question be different for men than for women? Recently I learned of an on-campus interview in which a highly-qualified candidate was repeatedly asked about marital plans. He had none, and he was not offered the position. While a woman might have perceived the questions as evidence of sex discrimination, in the case of a man, there resulted an implied discrimination based on sexual orientation. And what possible relevance can there be between marital status and the ability to teach in a particular literary subfield?

The task of sensitizing the interview team for the convention is considerably less challenging than orchestrating an on-campus visit where more people will have more opportunity to violate the law and/or offend the candidate. If your department has a clown who still thinks that personal questions are appropriate or that ethnic and sexist jokes are funny, I can only suggest that you seat the candidate as far away as possible at the luncheon table. As a short-term solution, for favorably impressing a candidate you want to hire, a little distance may suffice. In the long-run, however, faculty members must be educated in order to create a climate in which sexual/gender or racial/ethnic harassment does not occur.

It may take considerable skill to persuade recalcitrant faculty members that their long-standing practices have a discriminatory impact and therefore must be changed, but the chances of convincing a person denied tenure or promotion that the decision was unbiased are slimmer still. (Who can go through a protracted tenure review process without becoming a bit paranoid? Moreover, all of us prefer to believe that the fault lies in the stars, not in ourselves.) When grievances arise, the best departmental defense is a strong record, not only in hiring and retention of women and minorities, but of fair and open procedures: evidence of what sociologists would call a proactive, rather than a reactive, stance. Absent clear guidelines and standards, preferably in writing, personnel actions may be interpreted as "arbitrary and capricious," a legal pitfall to be avoided at all costs.

Discrimination may occur not only in recruitment, hiring, salary, reappointment, and promotion—the areas we think of first—but in all aspects related to terms and conditions of employment. In foreign language departments, for example, discrimination may readily be alleged if advanced courses are routinely assigned to native speakers of the target language and beginning courses to native speakers of English. With such a pattern, a department will have a difficult time establishing that a negative tenure decision for an Anglo assistant professor was not based on illegal discrimination.

Even the times and places courses are scheduled may come under scrutiny. Two contrasting cases from my own university will illustrate my point. Several years ago the only black faculty member in a particular department filed a grievance when he was denied tenure; he alleged bias, observing that he had also been the only one regularly assigned classes away from the main campus. When the chair asked my advice on how to respond, I asked if the charge of de facto segregation was true. It was. Was there a signed statement in the file that the faculty member requested his assignment to the satellite location? There was not. Why had other faculty members never been rotated there? They had never thought of it. From inaction, the department had established a visible pattern of bias in scheduling that would obviously cast in doubt any subsequent personnel decisions.

In my own department that same year, a colleague alleged bias in assignment of class hours, claiming that native speakers of Spanish were given the least desirable times, early morning and evening. Preparing our response was fairly simple. We could demonstrate a non-discriminatory pattern in rotation of faculty for the evening classes. Because we circulate and file occasional questionnaires asking colleagues what their real schedule preferences are, we could prove that a particular Hispanic colleague, no longer at the university but mentioned by the grievant, had always taught early morning classes because they were his first choice. Case closed.

What are the areas of possible contention within the department? The endless list of pertinent issues might include the basis for determining teaching load, distributing travel monies, or approving sabbaticals. Criteria for reappointing teaching assistants and part-time faculty are also relevant equal opportunity concerns. The department should develop policies to guide the chair. Better yet, the chair should have the advice of representative committees, and the department should create appeal mechanisms in order to resolve minor problems quickly in a collegial manner.

There are several key factors to consider in keeping on the right side of equal opportunity laws: 1) General awareness of protected categories; 2) Sensitivity to practices that are, or may appear to be discriminatory, and rapid response to complaints; 3) Development and even-handed implementation of appropriate departmental policies; 4) Good record-keeping.

In the past several years, there has been much discussion in academe of the need to mentor minority and women faculty. Certainly department chairs have the obligation to meet periodically with all junior faculty in order to provide evaluations and guidance. (In our litigious society, it is wise to keep a log of such meetings.) Proper mentoring can create a positive environment for professional growth. It is precisely the opposite climate of that created by sexual or racial harassment.

Illegal harassment in the work-place is not to be confused with the free speech issue, raised recently with respect to campus policies regulating student conduct, nor is it limited to physical harassment. Verbal harassment, including sexual innuendo and racial/ethnic slurs, is a form of prohibited discrimination when exercised by those in positions of relative authority or when the conduct has the effect of unreasonably interfering with the employee's work performance. Many colleges and universities offer consciousness-raising programs on the subject of harassment for students and faculty and provide procedures for making complaints. Some chairs may want to supplement these initiatives with departmental discussions, involving teaching assistants and teaching adjuncts, as well as faculty at all ranks.

An open dialogue may be the best way to prevent unpleasant episodes. When and if complaints of harassment occur, the chair must report them to a higher supervisory level; under EEOC guidelines, the employer is responsible for acts of harassment in the work-place "unless it can show that it took immediate and appropriate corrective action" (Franklin, 29). While wide publicity has been given nationally to cases of sexual and racial harassment, EEOC guidelines on language discrimination and ethnic harassment, released in 1980, are also particularly relevant for foreign language departments, where native, non-native, and ethnic speakers of the same language must live in harmony.

While the job of department chair is often complex, the underlying principles of equal opportunity are simplicity itself: evaluate individuals on their professional merits, encourage them to do their best, and treat them with courtesy and respect. By establishing a positive climate and fair procedures, you can avoid most problems and have a basis for appropriate response when complaints do occur.

NOTES

[1] In the New York-New Jersey area at least, I believe that the situation of the Haitian student now parallels that of the Hispanic Caribbean student of twenty-five years ago. French departments in our region have a strong potential for enlarging the number of black students enrolled in their programs.

[2] The latest of these federal laws are the 1990 American with Disabilities Act, which became effective 26 July 1992, and the 1991 Civil Rights bill. College and university affirmative action or personnel officers should be able to provide information on the state and federal laws affecting a particular institution. Department chairs should also consult non-discrimination policies in their faculty handbooks and collective bargaining agreements; complainants are generally required to exhaust internal grievance procedures before seeking court remedies. Also of interest is the policy statement of the American Association of University Professors, *On Discrimination*.

[3] These states are Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Rhode Island (Franke).

[4] The prohibition on pre-employment inquiries notwithstanding, department chairs may have to complete affirmative action surveys for their institution in which they guess the race and sex of all applicants. Although it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of U.S. citizenship in the interview process, in actual hiring a special case has to be made to hire anyone who does not have citizenship or a permanent visa. Dealing with forms from Immigration and Naturalization can make affirmative action reports look like a piece of cake.

WORKS CITED

Franke, Ann H. "Legal Watch: Politics, Law, and Lesbian and Gay Faculty." *Academe* 78.2 (March-April 1992): 100.

Franklin, Phyllis, Helene Moglen, Phyllis Zatlin-Boring, and Ruth Angress. *Sexual and Gender Harassment in the Academy. A Guide for Faculty, Students, and Administrators.* New York: MLA, 1981.

Huber, Bettina J. "Incorporating Minorities into Foreign Language Programs: The Challenge of the Nineties." *ADFL Bulletin* 21.2 (1990): 12-19.

CHAPTER 17

Women's Issues: Sexism, Joint Appointments, and Other Troublesome Matters

---

Constance A. Sullivan
University of Minnesota

Institutionalized higher education in this country was founded by men for men and was predominantly populated by men until after World War II. Now, however, more than half the population of U.S. college students is female. Women are undertaking graduate study in ever larger numbers (especially in the humanities and the social sciences), and the proportion of Ph.D.s earned by women has shot up appreciably in the last twenty years: in the field of foreign languages, about sixty percent of all doctorates were being granted to women by the late 1980s. The last bastions of resistance to women in academe—tenured faculty positions, full professorships, deanships, vice-presidencies, and presidencies—are beginning to crumble in the face of these new educational demographics and as Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action regulations attack the informal Old-Boys' networks that perpetuated male preference no matter what the quality of the competition from women.

Treating women and men as equals in a higher education setting is still difficult to do, and the road thus remains harder for women. As faculty, staff, students, and administrators, women face discriminations that run the gamut from blatant to subtle, and from difficulties sometimes caused by their own—as well as men's—socially-constructed expectations about appropriate or "natural" gender attitudes and behaviors. In academic departments where men have long predominated, the mere physical presence of a woman or two as colleagues may seem disruptive or disconcerting, often without anyone's being able to articulate exactly why. In this context it is women who are seen as "different," in their dress and posture, voice, language use, research interests, preferred pedagogies, networking strategies, and their primary childcare responsibilities.

Some people (I am not among them) think that gender problems are complicated when the academic department consists of people of multiple cultural backgrounds. Multiculturalism is the norm for a foreign language unit, where there are usually at least three distinct cultures represented: the North American culture that surrounds the college or university and which may be represented in the department by some native English-speaking faculty, plus one or more "foreign" cultures whose languages, literatures, and cultures are taught in and through the department's curriculum and by faculty from those "foreign" cultures whose ideas and attitudes about women may be a great deal more traditional than those of their immediate surroundings. This cultural mix can make for greater confusion and stress when it comes to preventing unequal treatment of women of color and white women. However, foreign language departments in the U.S. have had a greater proportion of women students and faculty than have departments in scientific or technological disciplines. Because the absence, or limited presence, of women in a department exacerbates sexist attitudes and behaviors, the problems I am addressing in this essay may actually be less blatant or less crude in our departments than in other areas of a college or university.

Gender inequality is as much a matter of cultural training as it is of differential legal status. Thus, treating women equally with men becomes a matter of fighting the unconscious biases people bring to personal interaction along gender lines. Men and women who have absorbed the notion that women are "by nature" not only objects designed for sex and reproduction but more nurturing, more emotional, less intellectual, less hierarchical, and who speak more softly and diffidently than men do, will often automatically disdain or reject women (and men) who do not fit their preconceptions. Similarly, they automatically assume that women who *do* fit their idea of the "proper feminine" are by definition not really suited to be taken for authorities in their field, or to have an authoritative voice in their department's deliberations.

As a consequence, ambitious female academics who take their careers very seriously, speak forthrightly on departmental and disciplinary matters, and otherwise give evidence that they regard themselves as peers of the male faculty around them are perceived as dissonant, "unnatural," threatening. Discrimination against female faculty because men perceive them as sexual beings has materially negative effects for women, who are held to sometimes greater performance standards and attain lower professional status and pay, and fewer perks. Even recognizing today's greater awareness of gender discrimination and that some progress has been made, there is still a "chilly climate" in higher education for women—be they students in the classroom, staff in the office, faculty in departments and classrooms—that inhibits learning, research, effective teaching, and constructive collegial relationships.

The 60/40 differential between numbers of women and men who are now earning doctorates in our field will eventually lead to women's gaining more than half the tenure-track positions, but today men still hold from two-thirds to three-quarters of regular faculty jobs at U.S. colleges and universities. Further, the higher the faculty rank, the fewer women hold it, and the more prestigious the college or university, the fewer women one sees on the faculty. To the sounds of male academics' gnashing of teeth and the clashes of individual or class action law suits, women academics have struggled over twenty years to achieve tenured positions and salary equity with men. The salary battle has not been won: at every rank, female faculty still earn less than their male peers, with the greatest disparities evident at the full professor level, due to past salary discriminations that intensify with each annual percentage increase to existing salaries. The greatest number and percentage of women faculty are temporary or part-time instructors, untenured assistant professors, or some variant of the non-faculty, "teaching specialist" designation where tenure is completely out of the question. One of the scandals of U.S. higher education today, very visible in foreign language departments, is that more than half of all instructional personnel are now temporary or part-time. The largest group within that group is women. More men than women hold career-track faculty positions with good salaries, just as they make the curricular and policy decisions, chair departments, and enlarge their salaries and their institutional power by advancing to deanships, vice-presidencies, presidencies, or—alternatively—to endowed chairs where they teach a minimal schedule and devote their energies to being "distinguished scholars." Meanwhile, female secretaries, temporary instructors, and untenured faculty do "the grunt work" of the department for little money and less respect.

My generalizations may seem extreme, for academe has been and is changing along with our society. But the change is not simply slow; it is laborious, and statistics fall short of revealing the professional, psychological, and even physical toll that the effects of sexual discrimination and harassment take on women academics.

Here is a glimpse of the struggle. If as a student she has not already had to deal with sexual harassment by a professor, a female doctoral candidate may hear from her adviser, in sardonic understatement, that she will have to be outstanding in her field just to be considered as good as the average male. In her first job search as a new Ph.D. she will find that a man's age, physique, and marital status will be irrelevant to the selection process, while she had better be under thirty-five, attractive but not *too* attractive, and able to finesse the federally-illegal but always-asked questions about her marital status and plans, and her actual or potential motherhood. Interviewers will assume that she is an excellent teacher and will devote immense energy to instruction, advising, multi-section course supervision, committee work, and curricular development. A man will be asked about his research and publishing plans, and a "spotty" teaching performance as a graduate student will be less important than his theoretical approach to the study of language, literature, and culture. He will be offered a regular tenure-track job and a competitive salary, while a woman will be expected to be grateful for a job offer at all, and not to quibble about salary and benefits. Married or single, she, of course, may have to deflect a "pass" or two in the interviewing process or listen to some crude sexist jokes. If she has an interest in feminist theory, criticism, or pedagogy, some hiring departments will silently put her name at the bottom of the candidate list. (Note: If *he* is a feminist, one of two things may occur: his feminism will make him a top candidate—preferred to females—or the interviewers will wonder if he is gay, and silently put *his* name at the bottom of the list.)

When the young male Ph.D. gets to his new campus one or two senior male faculty will immediately take him under their mentor's wing. They will assist his initial course development, even offering their own syllabi as models, and persuade the chair to go easy on his teaching assignments. He will be invited to join the faculty club, to play handball, or to jog over lunch breaks several times a week with other male professors, to apply for the college's scarce research grants, and to participate in professional activities that will help build his tenure dossier. The new female assistant professor must forge her way alone, unmentored by the senior faculty: some men are afraid that professional mentoring means too close a relationship to risk with a woman, and the department may not have a senior female professor to help her. Her teaching load may be larger than her male peer's and consist of basic and introductory language courses that may or may not have anything to do with her research interests. The department will "ask" her to undertake extensive committee and supervisory assignments. When she speaks at faculty meetings, she finds herself frequently interrupted by a man who abruptly changes the topic of discussion but later appropriates her ideas as his, as if she had never been there or spoken at all. She probably does not know about the jokes and disparagements directed toward her as a woman by male colleagues in their informal conversations—the little fantasies and insults they exchange about her body and her sex life, their put-downs of her intellectual capacity.

The standards to which her male peer is held for tenure and promotion are blurry about teaching and service, but prioritize the publications and conference papers his less-demanding departmental schedule—and his close mentoring—have enabled him to produce quickly. By contrast, the faculty agonize briefly over *her* tenure decision because a negative vote will mean the loss of one of their best classroom teachers and advisers, and a committee workhorse. They conclude that it must have been the baby she had that prevented her finishing the book she was required to publish for tenure. Besides, who wants as a lifelong colleague a cranky, abrasive woman who may at some point file a sexual harassment or discrimination charge? Especially, one whose research and pedagogical technique challenge the comfortable departmental status quo?

If both these hypothetical scholar/teachers somehow receive tenure, her already lower salary will fall progressively farther behind his with the years. She will be asked to chair the department only when no one else can or will take that responsibility, and in that case she will have to be a superb administrator (i.e., no mistakes; visible and unassailable accomplishments on the department's behalf) just to be tolerated. No one will ever congratulate her on a job well done. Unfortunately as well, many male academics feel diminished when they are led by a female chair and tend to reassert "normal" gender hierarchy by treating her as an exalted secretary who is at their "beck and call."

We too easily forget that secretaries in the department workplace—ninety-nine percent of whom are women—are the constant victims of some of the crudest, most peremptory sexist treatment one will see. Males in our society regard secretaries as substitute mothers or wives, servants, or potential sexual conquests. Consequently, one might say that a true gauge of the degree of sexist negativity for all women in a department lies in how the male faculty interact with the secretarial staff.

A department chair's leadership can help to prevent, minimize, and eventually eliminate discriminations based on gender. Chairs can ensure that the department treats women and men equitably in crucial professional areas: graduate training and first job search, hiring new faculty, recommending salary increments and research support, promotion and tenure, and work assignments and expectations. I recommend that a department review its practices in all these areas with the purpose of developing specific written policy statements about each of them. Some North American colleges and universities now have written guidelines for faculty searches, hires, and promotions that try to build fairness into these processes, but the practice is not universal. Where institution-wide specific guidelines do not exist, a chair can work toward making equal treatment operant at the department level by raising the issue to colleagues and proposing the creation of relevant policies, perhaps using models that function well elsewhere. For example, departments can draft policy guidelines for graduate student research support and job assignment, the composition and procedures of faculty search committees, and specific criteria for faculty salary increases. Of vital importance are specific statements about when, how, and on what bases the department reviews and recommends probationary faculty members for tenure and promotion, and promotion to professor. Other policy statements can address how the unit develops teaching and course supervision assignments, and the way it decides who may take sabbatical and other research leaves. If a department can be led to consensus on the process and standards to be used in these decisions, the resulting written policy guidelines will contribute to containing or restraining tradition-bound preferential treatment for men. Then, however, the department must monitor its own close and honest implementation of policy guidelines.

In the day-to-day interactions among departmental colleagues a chair can help minimize problems associated with cultural expectations and practices that marginalize or actively harm women faculty, students, and staff. One of the toughest nuts to crack seems to be sexual harassment. It keeps happening, and most (but not all) of it is men using the power of their positions to obtain sexual favors from women or to retaliate for women's refusals to play that game. And today the habit of telling crude sexual jokes or stories that demean women or that belittle people of other races or ethnic groups falls in some states and universities within definitions of verbal harassment and can be grieved. A chair might attempt to set a higher standard for informal collegial conversation, and that may require speaking to faculty about the unpleasantness and pain caused by sexist and racist jokes and derogatory remarks. In addition, female students, staff, and faculty have become very aware of how these practices damage them and now are more willing to speak up when they occur.

What practical measures help to include women in the formal and informal activities of the department? If there is a faculty club on campus that serves as a focus of informal contacts, nominate female faculty to membership. Where faculty customarily join each other for lunch or coffee breaks, a chair can begin the inclusion of women by doing the initial inviting of several colleagues at a time, until the faculty get used to doing the same thing themselves. At faculty meetings the chair might make a point of soliciting the opinions of female faculty—as well as stopping male faculty who interrupt female colleagues in mid-utterance. When the chair notices that a male faculty member has appropriated a woman's previously-expressed idea or proposal as something he just came up with, the chair can remind the group whose idea it originally was. Scheduling meetings for times other than the crack of dawn or (more usual) late afternoon can make a huge difference in the life of (mostly female) faculty who have primary childcare responsibilities. They will be able to attend meetings without having to arrive late or leave early because they had to deliver a child to, or pick one up from, day care or school.

Female faculty members need mentoring—help in establishing professional networks and building a career—just as much as men do. Women just don't receive much mentoring. Department chairs can and should use their position to initiate regular conversations with female faculty about their teaching and research, putting them into contact with colleagues with similar interests in the department, the college or university, or the discipline at large. Good mentoring also includes watching that women faculty do not do too much committee work. On many campuses women "must be represented" on committees, and the problem is much worse for faculty of color, whose "representational value" has them running from committee to commission, while white males blithely concentrate on factors that will be central to their promotions. Strange as it may seem, because of the Woman-as-nurturing Mother stereotype women faculty often spend far too much time—and are expected by students to do so—in instructional-related activities like advising, new course development, supervision of courses, and special tutoring. Chairs and other faculty can curb this female tendency to devote intense or exaggerated efforts to teaching, if the department as a whole does not value it, by checking often with that colleague about how she balances her teaching with the other professional expectations the department has for her.

Many of today's academic couples met in graduate school, often in the same degree program, and some have married. Both want to pursue a full-time professional career with the same intensity as they want to live together. Joint appointments for a couple, in the same department or the college/university at least, were not a problem in the simpler, if sexist, past where assumptions all around were that the male partner alone would dream of, and get, a full-time faculty position in a particular college or university. His wife or partner would find a job elsewhere, change profession, or stop working altogether, unless the department had an occasional need for a cheap, temporary fill-in who just happened to have the qualifications of the regular faculty in the department (the regrettable situation of such "underemployed faculty spouses" perhaps most abusively proliferated in foreign language departments with unexpected, last-minute, basic and intermediate language course enrollments: "Whose wife speaks X language well enough to teach two sections of 103 this term?"). Nepotism rules, now vacated in most colleges and universities, often prohibited spousal appointments in the same academic unit. What to do, now that women professionals insist on working full-time and regular, right beside their spouse?

No universal solution to the problem of joint appointments exists, but to my mind there is only one point at which a department can freely decide whether it wants to, or can, hire spouses or partners: at the point of hiring or retaining one of them. Even at those moments, the only way a joint appointment situation will really work is if the department's faculty feel that they have not been coerced into hiring both partners. A sense of coercion breeds resentments and suspicions for the future, and the department's faculty must have the right to say "no" to the partner's hire. Of course, that may mean that the candidate they want to hire or retain against an outside offer will also say no. At worst, the situation will force the department to look at the next best candidate or to repeat the whole search. Having seen a significant number of different instances of joint hires or deliberations on joint hires, I conclude that losing one good prospective colleague is far preferable (because it is more easily fixed) to having an unwanted spouse or partner forced on the department.

The department must ask itself how much it wants that top candidate: enough to find a position for her/his partner in another department or a local college? Enough to argue with the dean for a second faculty line in what may not be the specialized area in which the department's program needs strengthening? Enough to hire someone whose qualifications do not meet departmental standards? Can the faculty agree on what possible problems might arise in the unit if the couple is appointed together and agree on how to address them? It seems to me that the key lies in clear and before-the-fact common understandings by all concerned of the advantages and disadvantages of the specific joint appointment. Knowing what may arise and that they are free not to hire both people might diminish faculty resistance to the situation and prevent future tensions in the department.

One advantage to accommodating requests for joint appointments is the employment stability of that couple. Joint appointments are hard to get, forcing the couple to continue searching until they find a place where they can live together as they work. Once they find it, they will tend to stay where they are, putting all their energies into their work rather than into the stresses of a commuter separation and constant job searching.

Other gender-related issues may appear on the near horizon—I see ageism and last-ditch resistance to feminist research and feminist pedagogy. But with new awareness of the weight and negative effects of the cultural gender biases we all carry, perhaps academic women will find the future road easier to travel.

CHAPTER 18

Spaniards vs. Germans vs. French vs. Russians vs. Italians vs. Chinese vs. Japanese, etc.: The Blissfulness of Multiculturalism

---

Normand J. Lamoureux
Holy Cross College

Take one generic liberal arts discipline—let us say, modern languages and literatures—and, under this single delectable departmental rubric, blend 25 1/3 vital professorial ingredients: 9 1/3 Spanish, 7 French, 3 German, 2 1/3 Russian, 2 Italian, 1 1/3 Chinese, and 1/3 Japanese. As an intellectual connoisseur, what would be your considered opinion of this not-so-exotic recipe from *The Joy of Learning*? Would this combination of ingredients be likely to produce a savory smorgasbord or a horrid hash? Do there exist master chefs able to combine such seemingly incompatible elements, make them complementary, and eventually create a satisfying delight for the intellectual palate?

For the past several years, my department, the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures at Holy Cross College, has been reviewing its structure and undertaking a reorganization. Holy Cross is a coeducational, liberal arts college with a stable enrollment of some

2,600 students. The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures comprises seven disciplines: Spanish, French, German, Russian, Italian, Chinese, and Japanese. Major programs exist in Spanish, French, German, and Russian. There are presently some 135 majors in the department. Holy Cross has recently reinstituted a foreign language requirement, which can be satisfied in the Classics Department but which in fact is administered for the most part by our department. The organizational model which I shall describe here arose from the department's collective considerations.

As interest in foreign languages continues to grow and other languages emerge to take their own place in the curriculum alongside the traditional ones, many foreign language departments are having to reconsider the arrangement whereby several language sections have coexisted in one department. In an institution with fixed enrollments from year to year, a department of modern languages like mine—in reality, seven academic departments in one—is not apt to experience sufficient growth in the so-called "minor" language sections to justify the creation of separate departments. It is understandable therefore that, as new areas of linguistic study are added to the curriculum, college administrators opt to situate them in the same department as currently existing foreign language programs. The fundamental question is: Are the interests of each of the various foreign languages essentially the same? And even if so, how can one single departmental chairperson oversee the entire structure and assure at the same time the well-being of each individual constituency?

Rather than form separate departments of French or Spanish or German or Russian, it has often been the rule in smaller liberal arts colleges to fashion a single department of modern languages comprising all of the modern foreign languages. Historically, French, German, and Spanish have made up the nucleus of such a department, and other languages have been added as interest, demand, and need dictated. At first glance, it makes sense to put the foreign languages together. After all, the study of any modern language today involves in varying degrees the same four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing the language. All foreign languages seek to develop proficiency in an idiom other than one's native tongue, and all modern language professionals seemingly share common goals where language is concerned. As a result of being housed together and working side by side, language professionals can ostensibly interact with one another on a day-to-day basis, and, if desired, easily engage in mutually beneficial comparative work, either in the same linguistic family or in totally different ones.

What is the problem then? Major difficulties among the various languages arise from disparity of size and consequent programmatic differences. Whether a language program at the college level is large or small depends in great part on the influx of students who have studied that particular language. The majority of students in American secondary schools select either Spanish or French as their primary foreign language. In many cases, these students are offered no other options. If they do well at the secondary level, they ordinarily choose to pursue the same foreign language in college, advancing as far as their abilities and interests take them. If secondary students have only moderate success in high school or are able to take but a limited number of years of the language, they may still decide to continue the same language in college in order to satisfy the foreign language requirement as expeditiously as possible. In either case, languages that are established at the high school level have a very distinct advantage since the other languages must compete for the attention of first-year college students who have no prior experience in those particular disciplines. It is clear that, in the current situation, Spanish and French programs at the college level are being heavily subsidized by the nation's secondary schools. To illustrate: In the seven language programs that constitute the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures at Holy Cross, the Spanish and French sections combined account for nearly two-thirds of the department's total enrollment (Spanish 40%, French 25%). German (14%), Italian (10%), Russian (7%), Chinese (2%), and Japanese (2%) together make up the other third. Fifty percent of the majors in the department are Spanish majors while 34% are French. Only 9% are German and 7% are Russian. There is as yet no major program in Italian, Chinese, or Japanese.

This disparity of size gives rise to a difference in programs and focus. Since most entering students have studied Spanish or French before, many are able to enroll in second-year or even third-year courses in these languages. Over the four years, they can thus advance to upper-level language and literature offerings, even without having to declare majors. The smaller sections, on the other hand, must focus on first-year courses in an effort to gradually build up enrollments that will ultimately support upper-level offerings. Without a constant supply of first-year students, these languages would not be able to establish any sort of program. Given the limited pool of students, the smaller sections are not in a position to offer a wide range of attractive courses each semester. There is thus a marked contrast in size and program emphasis between Spanish and French on the one hand, and German, Italian, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese on the other.

For the chairperson, the complexity of the situation is exacerbated by the existence of the foreign language requirement which practically guarantees that most students will spend some time in the modern language department, for perhaps as many as four semesters, in the pursuit of competency at the second-year level. In order to serve the 30-40% of the student body enrolled in my modern language department in any given semester, a staff of 22 to 25 full-time professors must be maintained. A faculty of this size in any one discipline already involves considerable responsibility. A department of modern languages, however, with its disparate grouping of Romance, Germanic, Slavic, and Asian languages all under one roof can prove unwieldy to the extreme. A single chairperson, striving not just to maintain the departmental status quo but in fact to encourage personal and programmatic growth while at the same time keeping everyone happy, is bound to encounter more than occasional difficulty. It is not always possible to wear seven distinct academic hats simultaneously, but that is in fact what must be done since the various sets of problems within the department are often unrelated. The needs of one section do not necessarily concern the other sections, and the resolution of a difficulty in one language is often of no help in dealing with a matter in another language.

The challenge to the chairperson of a modern language department is in essence the following: to promote the academic excellence and professional integrity of the department while working within a framework whose primary *raison d'être* is the convenience of the college administration. Within this one departmental structure, the separate and unique identity of each language must be acknowledged and confirmed. Each must feel that it is being dealt with equitably at all times and is being accorded the same dignity and respect as the others. It must be abundantly clear to everyone that "smaller" does not mean "of lesser importance and value." Each language must receive its due consideration and command a professional status equal to all others. In short, in the best of all possible worlds, every language section in the department should have all the means required to function effectively and to realize its growth potential to the fullest. The reality of limited resources, however, makes the achievement of this goal a chairperson's greatest challenge.

In principle, each of the seven language sections should constitute a separate academic department and enjoy the same privileges as other liberal arts disciplines, able to control their own destiny without having to factor in the needs of others. In practice, the creation of a distinct department for each language is simply not feasible in a small liberal arts college, and sometimes in much larger institutions. Continuing with the example of my department of modern languages and literatures, if seven new departments were to be formed from the present combined department, four of them would have fewer than three faculty members. Not only could such smallness foster a limited variety of views and a modest breadth of vision, but it could also compound the difficulty of decisions related to hiring, tenure, and promotion. Spanish and French, it is true, would be large enough to exist on their own, and Italian could easily be joined to either one of its sister Romance languages. That would still leave, however, a "department of German, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese," a unique combination of disciplines whose name would certainly not enjoy the same immediate universal recognition as a "department of modern languages and literatures."

The most practical solution, then, seems to be to retain the broad designation of a department of modern languages while working to relieve the unwieldiness of a situation where seven academic disciplines are managed by one chairperson. The organizational structure of a department of modern languages, it should be noted, is not necessarily unworkable per se. The chairperson, however, has to strive first and foremost—and continually—to make certain that each language section has control over its own fate, that each has the ability to make its own decisions in light of its own goals and objectives, and that each has the right of self-determination enjoyed by academic departments. Any practicable arrangement affording such relative autonomy could prove to be a compromise that is acceptable both to the college administration and to the language professionals.

Let us consider briefly one possible model in which a chairperson serves as the overall administrator of the department, directing its daily operation and accepting responsibility for its general functioning, while in each language section a coordinator other than the chairperson manages the day-to-day business of the section. Under such a plan, the chairperson 1) oversees the hiring of faculty, 2) presides over tenure and promotion deliberations, 3) coordinates the departmental schedule of courses to be submitted to the registrar, 4) administers the language requirement, if there is one, 5) chairs meetings of the entire department, 6) makes salary recommendations in consultation with section coordinators, 7) prepares departmental budget proposals for the following year in consultation with section coordinators, 8) manages common departmental budget items such as office and lab supplies, 9) supervises the departmental office and the language lab, and assigns office space, 10) takes care of departmental correspondence, and 11) writes the annual departmental report in consultation with section coordinators.

In summary, under this model, the chairperson is the administrator and spokesperson for the department, the liaison between the faculty and the college administration. The section coordinator is the administrator for the section, overseeing its daily operation and, in tandem with the chairperson, presenting its programs and needs to the college administration. At my college, the ordinary term for a chairperson, appointed by the dean, is three years; section coordinators are elected by the section for a one-year term. In deliberations involving tenure and/or promotion decisions, sectional distinctions are eliminated, and all the senior members of the department meet and act together as a single committee. In these deliberations, members from the candidate's section ordinarily have the strongest voice.

The prevailing philosophy in a department of modern languages should be one of shared responsibility. Since the chairperson's main role is to administer the entire department, it is clear that each section must itself shoulder the primary responsibility not only for the section's present functioning but also for its future planning in such key areas as curriculum and faculty development. Faculty members in a section must act as a standing curriculum committee, constantly reviewing and revising courses, and creating new ones to enhance sectional offerings. Senior members must not leave junior members to their own devices after hiring but must nurture candidates through the tenure process, assuring an understanding of the criteria, and giving guidance and help in meeting the norms of achievement. In short, as the chairperson's many responsibilities are reduced to a more reasonable level, it is incumbent upon faculty members to share and take on the vision for their own section and for the department as a whole.

One responsibility that weighs heavily and constantly on the chairperson of a department of modern languages is that of protecting the department's professionalism. As personnel demands increase with the accrued interest in foreign languages and the insistence on a foreign language requirement, some administrators seek to solve the problem by hiring part-time or non-tenure-track faculty. Even though there might be a good supply of excellent part-time language teachers, the chairperson must negotiate firmly with the administration on this issue.

The only way to assure a quality department is to have full-time tenure-track positions that are staffed by faculty members who offer a total professional dimension, i.e.; who are committed to meeting the highest standards of teaching, scholarship, and service prerequisite for tenure and/or promotion to a senior rank. Part-time teachers may be hired to meet temporary or partial needs, i.e., to take care of teaching assignments that constitute less than a full load. But chairpersons must insist on full-time positions where full-time needs exist, in order to guarantee the professional integrity of the department and put everyone on an equal footing. Given budget constraints within most institutions, this duty is particularly onerous at this time. Nevertheless the chairperson stands as the last defense against the gradual deprofessionalization of the department.

The organizational model proposed above does not exhaust all possibilities nor does it present the sole feasible formula. Far more important than specific organizational details is the spirit that prevails in the department. Given the variety of problems that beset a department of modern languages, the only sensible and enlightened approach is a principle of true cooperation: one for all and all for one. Any workable arrangement must be predicated on the good will and professionalism of everyone concerned. As professionals we all want the same basic things. We want the chance to develop our discipline to its full potential and, in so doing, we seek opportunities that are equal to everyone else's. That is why we desire the greatest possible degree of autonomy within the department. No one section can be allowed to dominate. Smaller sections must not be demeaned because of their size, and larger sections must not be begrudged their ability to offer more expansive programs. There must be equal dignity and respect for everyone.

Concern for one's primary interests is natural. It is the chairperson's job to see to it that everybody's interests are promoted and that all receive fair treatment. To develop an atmosphere of trust, chairpersons must make it a policy to share all information that comes across their desks so that everyone is cognizant of the data and premises on which decisions are based. Not only must assignments and chores be equitably distributed, but it is just as important that they be perceived as such. The best way to promote a spirit of cooperation within the department is through universal involvement and shared responsibility. That is why it is generally a good idea to rotate section coordinators on a yearly basis. All should serve in order to develop an understanding of existing problems and a corresponding willingness to participate in their solution.

The matter of the departmental budget, for instance, is a particularly delicate one. The preparation of the annual budget should involve the chairperson and the section coordinators, who together implement an apportionment formula previously worked out and voted upon by the entire department. In addition, to avert any possible mistrust and to maintain confidence in the administration of the department, the chairperson should circulate, or at least make available, copies of all budget memos, particularly monthly statements from the treasurer's office indicating what was spent in the previous month, where it was spent, and what the remaining balances are. If the chairperson handles all budget matters with characteristic openness, no one can harbor feelings of favoritism.

Departmental authority resides in the chairperson, who at all times must be aware of what is happening in the academic unit. Whenever a matter is to be taken up or a question is to be resolved, it is absolutely vital that it be handled through proper channels. Normally, issues should be raised and worked out within each section. Differences that cannot be reconciled at the sectional level should be brought to the chairperson. Only extraordinarily should a departmental matter have to be taken up with the dean. Administrative efficiency is greatly impeded—and trust and morale are seriously impaired—if faculty go over the chairperson's head and deal directly with the dean. There are times, of course, when a faculty member needs to meet with the dean. In such instances, the chairperson should be informed, as a matter of professional courtesy. Nothing can be so subversive to departmental organization nor so thoroughly undermine a chairperson's ability to function as the faculty's failure to respect the proper chain of authority. Faculty members must act with the same openness and professionalism that they rightly demand of the chairperson.

In a department of modern languages in a small liberal arts college, chairpersons are usually not considered as permanent appointments in the position nor are they ordinarily appointed for a lengthy term. Their most effective role, then, is that of head facilitator; their main purpose is to see to it that, above all, individual faculty members are allowed to do what they do best, thus maximizing each person's contribution to the department. The post of chairperson in a modern language department should not be considered a position of power but rather an opportunity to serve one's equals. The chairperson can do much to guarantee the professional integrity of the department by openly embracing the double principles of autonomy and equity as the foundation of departmental policy.

In closing, there remains one last observation or exhortation. All academic departments have differences of opinion. The existence of varying points of view represents a healthy situation where an exchange of ideas can take place regularly, to the benefit of everyone. Modern language departments are no different. We too have our disagreements, intensified at times by the very real differences among the languages as academic disciplines. Although we are not unique in having such discussions, other departments are sometimes quick to highlight these "League of Nations debates" and come to view them as endemic among modern language faculty, particularly if we ourselves continually reassert factional differences. If we are to offset this unfavorable impression, we must generously set aside internecine squabbling and, in an arena of equal and open opportunity for all, band together instead to focus on the elements that unite our disciplines. Rather than assume a narrow, defensive, and ultimately self-defeating posture, let us on the contrary take collective pride in and promote the broader mission in which we are all engaged and to which we have devoted our professional existence, viz., the study of modern languages, literatures, and cultures, within the framework of the liberal arts.

CHAPTER 19

Teaching Foreign Languages and Literatures: Confrontation, Coexistence, or Collaboration

Frank W. Medley, Jr.
University of South Carolina

One of the more perplexing challenges any department chairperson faces is that of promoting a harmonious working relationship among all the members of the faculty. In those departments where colleagues have what they perceive as diverse areas of expertise (i.e., culture, literature, linguistics, and pedagogy), not to mention the broader distinction of languages themselves, the task can be even more difficult.

Departments (and chairpersons) tend to recognize and react to professional infighting in a variety of ways. Some look at it historically and conclude that the situation has always existed and that they should simply continue to promote some variation of a "peaceful coexistence," rather than confront the issue and upset everyone. Others approach the problem in true academic fashion, forming committees who investigate and report their findings back to the faculty, who then decide to postpone action for at least one more year, in hopes that the issue will disappear and they won't have to deal with it at all. Still others maintain that the problem is a result of inadequate funding and that nothing can be done until the upper level administration takes some definitive action and the department has a larger budget.

It is the primary task of the chairperson to overcome this academic "sibling rivalry" and to encourage stronger departmental (or inter-departmental) cooperation and collegiality if a dynamic curriculum that meets the needs of the students and, at the same time, addresses the research interests of the faculty is to be maintained. Ultimately, the success of the department—and, by extension, that of the chairperson—depends more upon the ability of the faculty to work effectively as a group than it does upon the individual qualifications, achievements, or fame of the members of that staff.

Regardless of the approach taken by a chairperson to resolve this conflict of language/culture/pedagogy versus literature, success can be attained only when the members of a department begin to recognize and acknowledge that their colleagues have a contribution to make toward the common goals of the group. Hence, the first step toward the amalgamation of the unit must be to establish clearly stated goals and objectives for the department that reflect a consensus among the faculty.

In order to move a department toward collaborative goal setting, the chairperson must continually reassure all parties involved that consensus building does not weaken or "water down" any area. Instead, it enables the group to identify the desired outcomes of the collective effort of the faculty and provides insights into ways in which individuals' efforts can become mutually supportive. Once this common ground has been established, the group can begin to identify each person's role in the task of realizing these common goals, and it becomes clear that no one faculty member can be reasonably expected to do everything. On the contrary, responsibility must be shared among everyone if the department's goals are to be attained.

As departments of foreign languages and literatures, we have a variety of constituents whose needs must be addressed: students who are satisfying a core requirement for a liberal arts degree, students who are majoring or minoring in our own discipline at the undergraduate or graduate level, and students who are majoring in another area but who would like to develop a degree of functional ability in a language of their own choosing. Thus, whether we like it or not, foreign language departments must meet the needs of a broad spectrum of learners. And since our program cannot cater solely to our own majors, they, in turn, cannot be thought of as the *raison d'être* for our existence. On the contrary, in most cases the non-majors far outnumber the majors who populate our classes. Our challenge, therefore, is to meet the needs of a very diverse audience and to do so in such a manner that we do not shift completely to a "service" department to the extent that faculty are unable to continue to pursue their own agendas for research and scholarship.

Regardless of the mission of the department or the students who enroll in courses in foreign languages, it is most likely that the program of studies begins with a focus on the development of language skills, followed by courses in which the content (i.e., genre, period, region, culture, theme, etc.) becomes the central concern. Too often, we view the study of language and literature as dichotomous, in that the two seemingly represent different phases or "levels" of instruction, with decidedly different goals. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon to find some senior faculty members who justify the fact that discussion in their literature classes is conducted in English, and students are permitted to write term papers in the same language because their linguistic skills in the target language are not adequate to enable them to discuss the course content otherwise. It would appear that these faculty members prefer to think of themselves as purveyors of ideas, rather than as language teachers, and presume that someone else—most likely a junior (and untenured) colleague—should be held responsible for teaching the language.

This attitude, at best, smacks of complete ignorance of everything we know regarding the amount of time required to develop language skills, and, at worst, it is a manifestation of an academic and egocentric elitism that is completely intolerable in a department that is striving to become truly collaborative and to function in the best interests of the students themselves.

Regardless of our personal preferences for particular courses and content areas, we need to remember that as members of departments of foreign languages and literatures we are all—first and foremost—language teachers. Said another way, our ability to teach content is not enough. We must also develop within those students who continue their study of the language beyond the basic levels the linguistic and communicative skills necessary to enable them to address content in the target language both orally and in writing. For us as practitioners, that translates into the responsibility to teach language at all levels, to teach strategies in the more advanced courses that will result in the ability of our students to analyze, criticize, and hypothesize.

Within our departments, the programs should reflect a concern for developing both the linguistic and cognitive skills of our students. We need to plan every course in our curriculum with an awareness of how that course articulates with those that come before it and those that follow it. This level of organization necessitates regular interchanges among the faculty teaching those courses.

If we are to attain our goal of producing students who can use the language effectively and accurately, and in a manner that is acceptable and appropriate to native speakers of the language, it is likely that we will need to begin to incorporate more literature into our language courses, and more language into our literature courses.

In those classes taught by instructors who do not have a strong background in literature or culture, it would be an excellent idea to invite a colleague to visit the class and provide interesting insights that would not be included otherwise. When this strategy is implemented effectively, beginning and intermediate language classes become excellent recruiting fields for potential foreign language majors and minors, since the novice learners have an opportunity to become acquainted with members of the faculty other than their own professors. Conversely, literature professors can talk with their colleagues who have a background in pedagogy regarding strategies that might be employed to teach students to read, particularly in the introductory literature courses where students have had little exposure to connected text and may feel overwhelmed by it.

Of even greater benefit would be for professors in literature and culture classes to begin to incorporate multimedia presentations into their instruction, perhaps through the use of overhead projectors, transparencies, and videotaped presentations of literary selections being studied. Numerous sources of these materials are available, and they are not prohibitively expensive. For those institutions with interactive video stations, the use of laser disk technology has tremendous potential for incorporation into the more advanced classes, and it is likely that colleagues in pedagogy will have some knowledge of the application of this hardware and software in the content areas.

The overwhelming majority of our majors who graduate with a degree in a foreign language and who continue to use their language skills for employment purposes teach. Those who obtain a baccalaureate degree and continue their studies at a more advanced level usually do so as graduate teaching assistants. That being the case, some pedagogical principles should be included in our major sequence of studies. This usually means that it would be beneficial to have at least one colleague who has some formal training in methodology and second language acquisition and who can develop a course for inclusion in departmental offerings. Sometimes it is necessary to conduct the course in a *lingua franca*, probably English, so that majors from different language tracks can enroll in the same section.

It has been said that many departments suffer from having too many experts and not enough expertise. In reality, many of our faculty—while excellent scholars in their own field—are simply not able to adapt to the changing needs of the department and of the student population. Our challenge as chairpersons is to design a mechanism through which the combined skills of two or more specialists can be channeled towards a task which neither of them would be able to accomplish individually. We can provide opportunities for colleagues to work collaboratively on the development of a new course and perhaps even use a team teaching approach when the course is offered. Opportunities for overlays of culture or linguistics on a literature base abound, and with two faculty members brainstorming on the possibilities, there are numerous new, interesting, and academically sound variations in course content and instruction that could emerge.

Another approach that chairpersons can take toward generating an atmosphere of mutual respect among colleagues is to encourage a departmental initiative to reconsider the retention, tenure, and promotion criteria of the unit. The purpose of the review would be to determine whether the current criteria that lead to the appointment of permanent faculty are an accurate reflection of the kinds of expertise needed in the department. Will faculty who meet these criteria add a dimension to the department? Are there other needs (for example, expertise in curriculum development or computer skills) that might be identified but are not recognized by existing definitions as appropriate areas for research and productive scholarship? Although this process calls for considerable introspection and can be quite painful, it often serves to provide faculty with a new perspective of the extent to which value is placed upon the qualifications and performance of faculty members by the unit itself.

As departments attempt to redefine the academic trinity of scholarship, service, and teaching, it is well to keep in mind that most of us find it somewhat threatening to support or endorse changes in criteria that represent a major departure from our own patterns and records of professional performance. The fear is that, by agreeing to changes in the traditional criteria, we are somehow diminishing the significance of our own accomplishments. In order to avoid this preoccupation, it is a good idea to talk more about *expanding* the criteria, rather than changing them, since expansion implies that greater diversity can be embraced under the rubric, without having to delete any of the existing manifestations of performance.

The Modern Language Association has recently acknowledged the need to broaden our rather limited literary definition of scholarship to include recognition of scholarly work in the areas of language learning and teaching. Professor Heidi Byrnes, of Georgetown University, reports in the Summer, 1992, *MLA Newsletter* that the MLA Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages and Literature has as one of its major goals

> ...to foster greater professional recognition of scholarly work in the areas of language and teaching. The widespread unfamiliarity with this work, along with a disregard for it and, by extension, for those engaged in it, is probably one key reason that undergraduate and, perhaps even more grievously, graduate departments in the field continue to present programs and curricula of limited vision, a practice that is most dramatically reflected in allocating resources and in hiring and retention policies.
>
> The committee intends to engage in various publication efforts to bring the substance of language-learning research into professional consciousness, in the hope that greater awareness of the scope of the issues this research addresses and the insights it provides will stimulate a much needed internal professional dialogue in language and literature departments, at the undergraduate and graduate levels (p. 17).

One way in which this disdain for certain types of scholarship manifests itself, particularly towards specialists in pedagogy, is in the reluctance of some colleagues to accept textbooks as research-based publications. Textbook authors retaliate by pointing out that they do not have to pay subventions or resort to vanity presses to have their materials published and suggest that perhaps the size of a print run might be a more accurate indicator of the relative importance of a title than is the esoteric nature of the topic.

The November 4, 1992, issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* cites James Lichtenberg, a communications consultant in education, who writes in the September-October issue of *Change*:

> Especially in the more elite institutions, potential textbook authors find among their colleagues an undercurrent of disdain for college textbook writing. Faculty mentors and department heads are reported to counsel against spending time on textbook authorship, portraying it as something of "no academic value" that may even work against success in promotion and tenure (cited in *CHE*, Nov. 4, 1992, p. B-2).

Obviously, neither group occupies a position that is unassailable, and the polemic continues.

As most authors know, the broader the appeal a topic has, the easier it is to find a journal or a volume that will publish the work. This should not mean, however, that colleagues whose areas of interest are highly specialized should be discouraged from pursuing those topics simply because they do not have a wide readership. On the contrary, the challenge might be to have the topics treated in such a way that previously uninterested journals would consider them for publication.

A more collaborative approach to resolving this problem would be for the members of the department to discuss openly their views regarding what constitutes research and productive scholarship—both print and non-print—and include a range of possibilities that embraces the areas of expertise of the entire faculty. They might also consider collaborating on articles that would cross traditional borders of interest and appeal to a new audience. Examples of this type of publication would be an article that discusses the role of student-centered outcome statements in a literature class or using literary texts as sources of information on the historical development of language. Numerous possibilities exist for "repackaging" the results of our expertise to make it of greater significance to a wider and more diverse readership.

Other issues need to be discussed and resolved regarding research and productive scholarship. Should a distinction be made between scholarly opinion, empirical research, and descriptive research? If so, how is each to be defined, and what weight should be attributed to them? How do articles or books that represent informed scholarly opinion compare to more experimental or anecdotal reports of behavioral research? How should the relative contribution to the profession of these different types of investigation be determined? How will articles published in refereed journals be weighted in comparison to those that appear in conference proceedings? What if the conference proceedings are refereed and include only selected papers? How significant are presentations at professional meetings and conferences? Is there a difference between presentations that are invited and those that are made as a result of responding to a call for papers? Is it possible (even likely) that a paper delivered at a large professional meeting might have a greater impact on the profession than one buried in some obscure publication? In terms of style of delivery, should more, or less, credit be given for presentations that are delivered from notes than for papers that are read to an audience? Should the ability of researchers to relate to their audiences be a factor in rating their contributions to the profession? The extent to which a faculty can agree on the answers to these questions will determine the effectiveness with which they can work together as a community of scholars.

A word of caution, however. One of the very real dangers in placing too much importance on the democratic process of establishing departmental standards is that there may well be no faculty member in the group qualified to assess the contribution that some areas of research and productive scholarship make to the profession. This is particularly the case when specialists in pedagogy or applied linguistics are asked to evaluate the dossiers of literature professors, or vice versa. In order to avoid this problem, especially in tenure and promotion cases, departments should insist that scholarship be evaluated critically by outside referees who are knowledgeable in the field and who can comment on the contribution the work makes to the profession.

In conclusion, the greatest possibility for avoiding confrontation and promoting collaboration and professional recognition of colleagues across divergent areas of interest within our departments lies in encouraging them to talk about and agree on a comprehensive definition of research and productive scholarship. This chapter has touched on several topics and will undoubtedly raise numerous questions that have not been addressed. Clearly, research should be evaluated on its own merit, rather than on the basis of the medium (print or non-print), the purpose (literary, linguistic, or pedagogical), whether a subvention was paid, whether a vanity press was involved, or whether the author realized a financial profit as a result of the work. It is incumbent upon the departmental chairperson to guide the department as it considers these questions and arrives at a consensus.

The successful chairperson will promote activities and discussions among faculty that generate an awareness of the fact that we are much more drawn together by our common concerns than we are separated by our divergent interests. To the extent that we are willing to work together as colleagues in an environment of mutual respect, we will be able to plan and deliver a program that will have a positive effect on our students' linguistic skills and on their overall intellectual development. In so doing, we fulfill our role as educators and mentors, *quod erat faciendum.*

WORKS CITED

Byrnes, Heidi. "Committee Update and Request for Members' Input." *MLA Newsletter* (Summer 1992).

Lichtenberg, James. "Rigor, Partisanship, and Multiculturalism; Disdain for Writing College Textbooks; Laughter in the Theater." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 4 Nov. 1992: B2.

CHAPTER 20

The Foreign Language Department and Less Commonly Taught Languages

Nelson H. Vieira
Brown University

> "A schoolmaster is not one who always teaches but one who can suddenly learn."
> —João Guimarães Rosa, *The Devil to Pay in the Blacklands*

> "I don't want what is already made, but what is tortuously in the making."
> —Clarice Lispector, *The Stream of Life*]

The faculty of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTs) frequently relate to the sense of marginalization experienced by frustrated and disheartened second- or third-class citizens who resent the first class's reluctance to relinquish any portion of its domain, especially so in times of economic constraints. However, from our viewpoint, self-empowered LCTs can carve out their own space within or outside departments and, moreover, can secure a vibrant future in the university without depending upon the largesse of the dominant foreign languages. A less-marginalized status is usually achieved after years of steady, incremental gains that empower LCTs to forge their own paths cumulatively, and possibly beyond the shadows of dominant FLs.

As suggested by the two passages selected as epigraphs for this discussion of LCTs, *process* is the key to the LCTs' survival as well as the source of their strength because with LCTs the never-ending struggle for existence can be used to instill in the staff a spirit of non-complacency that in turn can be tapped as a positive stimulus for independent action. As directors and chairpersons know all too well, complacency is a deathtrap for FL programs unwilling to see beyond the status quo. And because Spanish, French, and German have traditionally dominated the FL curriculum and will continue to do so for some time, LCTs are prepared by experience to expect an uneven topology on the FL battleground, a perception useful in building the stamina needed to reconnoiter this treacherous terrain.

Added to this reality is the notion that, as marginals, LCTs do not possess a substantial identity or presence of their own, a perspective stemming from historical assumptions based primarily upon quantitative values—the numerical amount of student interest in a specific FL. Thus, it is our belief that unless an LCT creates a dynamic and unique identity of its own with the aim of demonstrating its qualitative value and intellectual potential, it will never be able to sustain itself in any meaningful fashion. And for department chairs who may or may not teach LCTs, the only viable stance for ensuring an LCT's existence and maintenance is to recognize its curricular uniqueness, be it within or outside the FL department, assuming, of course, that the LCT possesses a strong enough identity to command such recognition.

If the staff of an LCT chooses to blame colleagues of the dominant FLs for their lack of openness and support, for stifling the growth of LCTs, or for coveting their own language specific hegemony, then the future for an LCT may indeed hold little promise because its staff fails to understand that any unit's success in an institution of higher learning depends upon three major factors: 1) the ability to build a professional identity; 2) the capacity to create a need or market for one's subject matter; and, above all, 3) the willingness to understand how an institution of higher learning functions. All of these elements constitute a learning process entailing analysis, strategy, and vision that should be channeled into growth activities within and outside departmental parameters, not with the intent of ultimately bypassing departmental structures, procedures, or policies, but with the goal of exploring and exploiting more extra-departmental resources available to LCTs. Instead of fantasizing over the possibility of achieving an identity parallel in size and status to the dominant FLs, LCTs can become meaningful components in the larger undergraduate curriculum if they pursue and cultivate their own uniqueness, regardless of size. Furthermore, since university administrations themselves often fantasize, usually about "doing more with less" during times of economic constraint in the vain hope of continuing to foster growth, the LCTs should not be discouraged because their collective history reveals a "doing more with less" *modus vivendi*. Thus, they should take advantage of the ingenuity and courage gleaned from this stance. But lest the reader misinterpret the last comment as a maxim that LCTs can never aspire to significant growth and larger budgets, allow me to affirm the contrary most emphatically by underscoring my conviction that LCTs can grow and develop into meaningful and permanent components within the university.

The path of action toward the creation of a unique identity for an LCT may follow this suggested scope and sequence: 1) A **focus** reflecting a specialty, a disciplinary approach, or a well-defined role in the overall context of the undergraduate curriculum; 2) A **style** demonstrating imaginative and cost-efficient offerings, dynamic staffing, self-empowerment, vanguard pedagogy, an active program of research and publications, and, if possible, aggressive grantsmanship; as well as 3) A **structure** designed to accommodate student and faculty needs, to facilitate formal and informal linkages with colleagues in other units, and to channel multi- or interdisciplinary activities as well as broad curricular service across the university. Here, the ultimate goal is meaningful **integration** in the curriculum where language as well as literature becomes an integral part of its course offerings.

The shaky status of many LCTs is actually due to canonical educational attitudes that, frankly, are outmoded and tied to a rigid history of course offerings linked to a traditional or First World global stance that invariably dismisses LCTs by interpreting pejoratively the intentionally neutral "less-commonly-taught" as "less important." It therefore behooves an LCT to follow the path toward a new identity and a renewed sense of importance in order to establish a dynamic presence *vis-à-vis* the university curriculum and community as well as its own professional field.

Unfortunately, to reach this objective, LCT staff members usually have to grapple with such problems as institutional prejudice or ignorance, the snobbery of faculty of dominant FLs, departmental rigidity, and pedagogical stagnation. Not easily surmountable, these hurdles can be overcome by maintaining an unswerving commitment to the LCT's cultural values and also by taking various pragmatic steps. For example, an intensive search for support or assistance can be undertaken with the aim of first tapping human resources, instead of monies—perhaps a group of interested colleagues or a mentor/guardian angel in the guise of a senior faculty member. The latter may be an established and well known professor from another department who is willing to invest some time by serving as advocate, counselor, and overall sage. This individual's role may be justifiably double-edged, assisting others while at the same time expending energies and efforts for reasons of expanding and pursuing new professional interests. Mentors or interested and supportive colleagues are invaluable to an LCT seeking to integrate its offerings and programs across the curriculum.

To illustrate in a more concrete manner the above perspective and recommendations, the specific case of an LCT—Portuguese and Brazilian Studies (PBS) at Brown University—will be used, not as a model to be replicated, but rather as a reference for generating ideas about strengthening the resources and presence of LCTs in American universities. As an LCT not even acknowledged in its original department's title, PBS created an identity that developed from a third-class position to an interdisciplinary center and, more recently, to a full-fledged department—a process spanning two decades. As director for more than ten years of this venture, I became aware that team spirit and on-the-job learning were the best avenues and attitudes for making gradual but continuous headway. No two institutions are alike, and thus my focus here is to center upon those strategies and options used by an LCT in overcoming difficulties prejudicial to its growth.

To begin, a simple vision or plan is advisable so that pros and cons of expansion may be weighed within the context of the university's general direction, philosophy, and structure. Whether the vision be a concentration program, or ultimately the creation of a separate unit, an assessment of the university's approach to recent educational innovations and trends is crucial to understanding how an LCT can take advantage of these changes in gauging its own potential and development. For instance, it would be useless to pursue the concept of a separate unit—be it center, program, or institute—if the university has no structure for its foundation. On the other hand, the creation of a program within a department or between departments may be quite feasible, given today's more favorable climate in American education for interdisciplinary study. However, this path implies an honest predisposition to change, entailing self-evaluation and the expending of extra energies. Also, any long-range type of plan for growth usually relies upon a self-determining, non-dependent stance, nurtured by good coordination and active communication with diverse elements within the university. Moreover, a plan for expansion should also include an assessment of the university's overall educational direction as well as its educational position toward two areas of interest relevant to foreign languages and literatures—the role of international studies or education in the university and the existence of newly-formed disciplinary alliances where the social sciences and the humanities come together in cooperative projects. These two areas of interest can serve as the linchpin for enabling the LCT to enter into a network of cooperative activities and programs, ultimately leading to joint appointments and projects which in turn will enhance the LCT's general efforts toward meaningful curricular integration. These areas of consideration coupled with a university-wide search for human resources with mutual interests in the LCT contribute greatly to the formulation of a stronger identity for the LCT. For Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, this search led to the discovery of a number of colleagues whose research and professional activities related in some way, great or small, to the Portuguese-speaking world. As a result, an advisory board of professors and instructors from various disciplines was formed to oversee a burgeoning concentration program geared toward an interdisciplinary focus because these faculty members manifested interest in Portuguese through research, teaching, and field or community service that spanned such disciplines as History, Sociology, English (translation), Education (ESL/Bilingual/Cross-Cultural), Applied Linguistics, Comp. Literature, African-American Studies, Political Science, Anthropology, and to some degree, medical studies.

With an interdisciplinary advisory board, the possibilities for extended interaction between faculty members increased, resulting in more course offerings developed via team-teaching efforts and cross-listing. These combined efforts occasionally demanded teaching overloads, but they were considered necessary if the institutionalization of a viable PBS interdisciplinary concentration program was ever to be attained. Also, a program with its own curriculum, series of activities, stationery, and logo contributed in no small measure toward the creation of a distinct identity for the LCT. Although a concentration in Portuguese and Brazilian literature at that early stage would have suited the core staff trained in language and literature graduate programs, it was unrealistic to consider anything but an interdisciplinary approach, given the scholarly impact of the social sciences in the Portuguese and Brazilian field, to say nothing of the minimal staffing resources available in the humanities. Furthermore, because of the on-going reality of minimal university support and the LCT's decision not to rely solely on that support for expansion, the idea of challenging and attracting colleagues in other programs to provide some academic assistance by at least cross-listing their courses not only manifested itself in "creative" programming and staffing which had to pass the careful scrutiny of the College Curriculum Committee, but in many instances afforded these ancillary staff members a new lease on their academic lives by allowing them to explore new research interests while offering courses pertinent to the LCT's culture and civilization.

This ancillary staff plan also avoids the need for an LCT's director/coordinator to beg the university administration repeatedly, on an annual basis, for extra faculty positions, those elusive FTEs! In fact, this LCT's principal administrative strategy involved requesting an extra FTE only long after the LCT had received ongoing support from other sources, either in the form of voluntary faculty commitments or monies via grants. This strategy implied an understanding of the administration's apprehensions about investing in new programs without receiving from the inside and the outside some accountable or demonstrated indication of "real" support. Of course, this strategy also cultivated the idea that approval from the outside always carries more weight and wonder than in-house miracles.

The step from concentration program to a Center also adhered to the above strategy—a proposal made only after outside funding had been awarded to supplement some of the program's expanded needs in the areas of staffing, curricular development, and research. This concrete support was highlighted in the proposal for a Center for Portuguese and Brazilian Studies and in later proposals for new degree programs, intimating that such a unit would do its best to continue to acquire a major portion of its yearly funding from sources outside the university's overall annual budget. This plan of action has led to a present-day core staff of four full-time faculty members whose specialties are primarily literature, language, and culture. In addition, four other faculty members from other disciplines with joint appointments contribute to the interdisciplinary focus—all of whom are integrated into the unit's roster. These efforts were all motivated by the staff's commitment to the importance of the LCT's field on the national and international levels. The interdisciplinary route has proven to be fruitful in view of present-day interests in international and multidisciplinary perspectives as well as the increasing practice of nurturing more studies with a comparative focus.

Needless to say, these accomplishments and acquisitions, along with a series of new degree programs on the graduate level, were not achieved without frustrations. While bureaucratic machinations and paperwork were costly in terms of time and energy, one of the major difficulties toward progress was the general acceptance of the LCT's vision for expansion, a goal questioned by doubts about its feasibility to exist as a viable unit or program. These opinions were expressed by administrators and faculty with legitimate concerns as well as by those who held Old-Boy attitudes about the overall priority and importance of dominant FLs. Ergo, the need for the LCT staff to have readily available a well articulated and sound justification for the LCT's expansion. Also, the active participation of the LCT staff in the university's governing activities and committees contributed to an increase in the LCT's exposure among faculty and departments across the campus.

Since Portuguese, within Spanish and Portuguese or Romance/ Modern Language Departments, has invariably been overshadowed in numbers by Spanish, the most obvious question lies in whether or not it is financially and professionally feasible to pursue one's own course or destiny within a traditional department focusing primarily on literature. If an LCT's dialogue with other disciplines is regarded as trendy and non-rigorous by one's departmental colleagues, implying a diminution in the solid preparation of the mother discipline, in this case, literature, then perhaps it is advisable to look beyond the department.

Our emphasis upon an interdisciplinary approach reflects the strategy adopted by PBS as an LCT, but it is also given special attention in view of the growth in multidisciplinary programs across the country, in which, for example, social history has become integral to the study of literature. For a field such as Portuguese and Brazilian Studies in which several countries reflect a myriad of social variables impinging upon the expression of its cultures, research and study cannot be approached with any depth from one singular disciplinary angle. The need to integrate the study of literature into area programs based in the social sciences and vice versa has become increasingly apparent, particularly with the advent of cultural studies.

When an LCT program or center grows by acquiring more university-supported staff as it continues to receive outside funding, another important strategic consideration rests with its general appreciation of and policy toward language teaching, particularly with regard to methodology and the staff's instructional role in the teaching of the LCT. A positive and scholarly approach to the important role of language in the LCT's curriculum results in two distinct advantages: 1) More innovative teaching to attract students, such as intensive courses fostering the natural and communicative approach; and 2) The sharing of FL instruction by all faculty members as a teamwork and cost-efficient enterprise that allows students in the program early access to every member of the faculty. From the administration's point of view, the latter is also interpreted as a means of maximizing staff resources without creating a double standard within departments, one that looks down upon language teaching and thereby induces a sharp hierarchical split between those who teach literature and those who teach language. Furthermore, greater value placed upon FL teaching within the unit usually leads to the application of the latest methodologies for making FL study a more exciting and integral part of the unit's offerings.

For PBS at Brown, the linguistic premise of seeing the FL as an avenue toward knowledge and information, a philosophy gleaned at the inception of its program, when this LCT became involved with cross-cultural and bilingual education, has materialized into content-based intensive FL courses in which the primary goal is to use the FL as a medium of instruction and as a means for learning more about a country's culture and society. In terms of a university-wide effort, this kind of practice is presently reflected in the "FLs Across the Curriculum" program in which courses in the social sciences are taught through the medium of the FL. At Brown, as an LCT, Portuguese is the medium used to teach one section of a course in Brazilian history while Spanish, French, and Russian are used in other non-literature courses. Above all, the creation of a sound language program aimed at making students functionally proficient in the quickest amount of time, one that circumvents the normal and often tedious progression of beginning language courses, can bestow added distinction upon an LCT by singling out its leadership and innovative practices in this area of the curriculum.

After 20 years of participating in the above mentioned activities and adopting strategies that would foster the LCT's integrated role across the curriculum, Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, as stated earlier, recently acquired departmental status at Brown. With the recommendations of an outside review, it became clear that departmental status was important for ensuring the LCT's permanency within the university—its institutionalization and image as a legitimate and proven field of study—as well as enhancing the LCT's national position in the field. Also, the new status allowed for more palpable gains in terms of in-house and outside support such as more graduate fellowships as well as formal agreements with foreign university departments because the LCT's institutionalization pointed to the university's giving its imprimatur to this program's achievements. In retrospect, the interdisciplinary route was indeed most advantageous for PBS at Brown because along the way it profited from the multidisciplinary thrust and the increase in international education. Thus, from our viewpoint, an LCT has access to more viable options and justifications for its existence and growth if it follows an interdisciplinary direction instead of merely striving to replicate a dominant FL's traditional curriculum.

If contemporary educators speak about more **inter**action in relation to the **inter**connectedness of the world, its peoples and systems, then it stands to reason that the obvious objective correlative here should be the **inter**relatedness of such curricular areas as FLs, Literature, Linguistics, and Culture alongside History and the Social Sciences, with, for example, focus upon issues such as ethnicity, gender, race relations, technology, and ecology. To secure a firm understanding of another culture *vis-à-vis* the world's complexity and diversity, a multidimensional approach must be pursued to show how language, literature, and culture work across disciplines.

In conclusion, this apology to international and interdisciplinary studies serves to illustrate how an LCT can prosper if it is predisposed to exploring the possibilities of the ongoing educational climate. In this vein, two points bear reiteration as significant courses of action toward ensured growth and meaningful integration in the overall university curriculum: 1) An educational identity, vision, or policy that challenges traditional concepts of teaching and programming; and 2) The establishment of fiscal independence via the tapping of the university's human resources or other forms of support such as outside funding. This second point translates into the LCT's future bargaining power (money talks) by providing the administration with evidence that outside resources recognize, value, and support the LCT's program. The first point implies a willingness to be open to non-conventional FL programming whereby other disciplines and programs can intermingle purposefully with the study of language and literature.

The combination of interrelated curricular programs, activities, and strategies, continued grantsmanship, as well as creative staffing and ongoing dialogue with colleagues from other programs and disciplines, can broaden the range of options for an LCT. In this case, the above combinations led to an LCT as an autonomous university unit with its own identity and reputation, outside the purview of the dominant FLs, but still working with them, that is, an expanded quality program very much in contrast to its third-class LCT status of twenty years past. Today, via joint appointments, linkages with other programs and departments, foreign study abroad, agreements with foreign universities, an active press, two journals, a staff steeped in research, publications, and grants, as well as a series of offerings stressing intensive language teaching for "functional proficiency," topics and theme courses along with conventional areas of study, this LCT department explores, facilitates, and services linkages with such university units as History, International Studies, African-American Studies, the Center for Language Study, the Program in Judaic Studies, the Center for Race and Ethnicity in America, and others. The interaction among scholars results in the exchange and sharing of ideas, readings, bibliographies, and research. Moreover, despite this inter- and multidisciplinary ambience, the core staff, trained primarily in literature and language, has not been forced to compromise its specializations and scholarship in these areas of study. In fact, the four undergraduate and graduate degree programs rotate on a language and literature axis.

With strong visibility on the university campus due to its various linkages, busy-beaver identity, structural independence, scholarly activities, and longed-for institutionalization, this LCT finds that such issues as enrollment figures *vis-à-vis* other FL numbers, as well as budgetary dependency and administrative indifference, rarely, if ever, surface. It is as if the LCT's empowered identity diminished the relevance of these other issues in the eyes of the university's administration.

In summing up the suggestions and recommendations for a more secure future for LCTs, one goal, besides institutionalization, stands out among all others—a more *integrated* role for LCTs across the curriculum. For LCTs, integration can eradicate the notion of "less-commonly" because active participation across the university curriculum can place them in "common" stride with the university's academic pulse, thereby circumventing the despotic notions and arenas of "dominant" and "less so" and consequently ensuring their unique and valid place within the academic community.

CHAPTER 21

The Foreign Language Department and Study Abroad Programs

Richard A. Zipser
University of Delaware

Over the past decade or so, a number of reports and studies have been published urging our nation's universities and colleges to internationalize their curricula and campuses, to strengthen their existing programs in international studies by combining them with foreign language and culture study, to make foreign language instruction more responsive to changing national needs by teaching more non-Western languages and courses in specialized professional areas, and to expand study abroad opportunities for undergraduates.

Let me mention a handful of titles that followed the publication in 1979 of *Strength Through Wisdom*, the report of President Jimmy Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: *Nation at Risk* (1983), the report of the National Committee on Excellence in Education; *Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange* (1988); *America in Transition: The International Frontier*, the 1989 report of the National Governors' Association Task Force on International Education; *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, the 1989 report prepared by Richard D. Lambert for the American Council on Education; and lastly, *A National Mandate for Education Abroad: Getting on with the Task*, the 1990 report of the National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad.

If there is a common theme to be found in these publications, it is that we "need to introduce an international dimension into the education of students while they are still in school or college so that they will be able to perceive and put into context events that take place abroad or across our internal cultural divisions" (Lambert, p. 2). It is important, not only for reasons related to the economic survival of the United States, that the majority of our undergraduate students become citizens of the world. To attain world citizenship students must be prepared to do the following: 1) To take internationally-oriented courses offered as part of the domestic curriculum; 2) To achieve functional competency in at least one foreign language; and, 3) To spend a period, preferably a semester or an entire academic year, studying abroad in a country where they will be able to use and improve their foreign language skills. Today's foreign language departments have a responsibility to help their students in all three of the areas mentioned above. I therefore urge you to consider, if you have not already done so, sponsoring one or more study abroad programs and also integrating coursework done abroad into your departmental offerings.

In the remainder of this chapter, I want to present some models of successful short-term and full-semester study abroad programs for you to consider. I will then try to anticipate and address some of the questions you and your colleagues are bound to have as you ponder the pros and cons of launching your own study abroad program(s). Given the limited space at my disposal, I will not attempt to construct theoretical arguments for departmental sponsorship of overseas study programs, nor will I be able to go into many of the policy issues that inevitably must be addressed at the institutional level. My purpose is to give you some practical information and suggestions based on my own experiences with study abroad programs over the past twenty years and to encourage you and your department to become involved on this important front.

At the University of Delaware, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures sponsors or co-sponsors eleven study abroad programs, all of which have been designed to meet the needs not only of the traditional foreign language majors and minors but also those of undergraduates from many other disciplines as well. Our study abroad programs can be divided into two basic categories: first, we offer short-term programs for lower-level students that take place during a five-week winter session (which runs from around January 3 to February 6); second, we offer full-semester programs for advanced students who already have a good working knowledge of the language. Let me briefly point out the distinctive features of both kinds of study abroad programs.

Short-term programs. Every January/February, we sponsor five-week winter session programs at universities in the following locations: Caen, France; Bayreuth, Germany; Siena, Italy; Granada, Spain; St. Petersburg, Russia (alternating years); Mérida, Mexico; San José, Costa Rica; and Fort de France, Martinique. With two exceptions, Mexico and Martinique, these programs are aimed mainly at students who are more or less at the second-year level of language study, giving them a unique opportunity to continue their language and culture study in native surroundings. To participate, students must have taken at least one semester of the language spoken in the target country, but most have had two or three semesters before departure.

In France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Costa Rica, we offer a limited menu of four intensive courses and require all students to take two of them, i.e., a total of six or seven credit hours. As an example, the courses offered in Spain are listed below:

Spanish 106: Elementary/Intermediate Spanish (4 cr.)
Spanish 107: Intermediate Spanish (4 cr.)
Spanish 206: Culture through Conversation (3 cr.)
Spanish 208: Contemporary Spain I (3 cr.)

All participants must enroll in a language course either at the 100 or 200 level, while also learning more about the host country by taking the course numbered 208. The contemporary culture course is a feature common to each program; it combines lectures in English on a variety of topics (for example, politics, education, local history) with visits to places of cultural and historical significance (such as museums, government offices, archeological sites, etc.). In most cases, students reside with local families, thereby having even greater opportunity to enhance their language skills and to expand their cultural knowledge.

The format of the programs we sponsor in Mexico and Martinique is slightly different, as one can see from the list of courses that are offered in Mexico:

Spanish 105: Elementary Spanish (4 cr.)
Spanish 167: Essential Spanish (1 cr.)
Spanish 207: Contemporary Latin America I (3 cr.)
Political Science 311: Politics of Developing Nations (3 cr.)
Art History 367: Pre-Columbian Art and Architecture (3 cr.)

Students are not expected to have any prior knowledge of a language to participate in these programs. They are able to begin (rather than continue) learning either Spanish or French, but we do not require them to do so.

Each winter session program has as its director a faculty member from our department; this individual is responsible for the recruitment of students and all the administrative tasks that must be done before departure and while the group is abroad. If the student enrollment is sufficient to justify it—a second faculty member may serve as co-director. Over the past five years or so, about thirty of our faculty have gone abroad with these short-term programs, so we now have considerable expertise to draw upon in the area of study abroad as well as a very experienced and enthusiastic group of recruiters.

Semester Programs. In addition to the short-term programs for language learners at the elementary and intermediate levels, the department sponsors three semester programs for advanced students in France, Germany, and Spain. These study abroad programs, which take place in the fall semester, are designed for sophomores, juniors, and seniors, *regardless of major*. In order to participate, students must have completed at least two 200-level (advanced intermediate) courses taught in the target language prior to departure. This we view as the minimal acceptable preparation for the 15 credit hours of coursework they are expected to do abroad in advanced language, literature, art history, civilization, political science, and history, with all instruction given in the foreign language. Mainly for pedagogical reasons, we have divided the semester artificially into two sessions of unequal length. Listed below, by way of example, are the courses that are offered in Germany. During the shorter first session, all students must take six credit hours—a language course (either 306 or 406, depending on the student's level) and the course on contemporary Germany (308), which is required of everyone. During the longer second session, they are expected to take nine credit hours, selecting three of the five courses listed in the second group below:

First Session (September 8 - October 16)
  German 306: Practical Oral/Written Expression (3 cr.)
  German 308: Contemporary German II (3 cr.)
  German 406: Advanced German Language (3 cr.)
Second Session (October 26 - December 15)
  Art History 339: Art and Architecture of Germany (3 cr.)
  German 355: Special Topics (3 cr.)

German 455: Selected Authors, Works, and Themes (3 cr.)
History 339: Topics in Modern German History (3 cr.)
Political Science 441: Problems of German Politics (3 cr.)

Since many participants are non-majors who may not be interested in literature, we have made it possible for them to put together a program of study that might include only two courses bearing a "German" prefix, a language course and the culture/civilization course. All of the courses are taught in German, however, by the native faculty and teaching staff.

The semester programs feature lodging in private homes, many group excursions and cultural activities at no additional expense, and a one-week fall recess in late October so students can travel independently. Each semester program has a resident director who administers all aspects of the program and assists students with academic and personal matters. This is a local person associated with the university, not a member of our own faculty. Finally, I should note that many of the undergraduates who take advantage of this full-semester experience at a foreign university already have participated in a winter session program at the same location.

1) **Why should my department get involved in study abroad?** This is a question that is difficult to answer briefly. The main reasons for having your own study abroad programs are in my view these: first, such programs will make your department more visible and attractive to students, and, in turn, should translate into increased enrollments at the advanced levels; second, most students who are majoring or minoring in a foreign language want to study abroad at some point, so it makes sense for you and your department (rather than another university or college) to help them achieve this goal; third, it is easy to integrate coursework done abroad into your domestic major and minor programs, if you have designed or modified these programs to accommodate study abroad.

2) **We have an Office of International Studies on campus. Aren't they supposed to develop and administer these programs for us?** In my experience, the offices in charge of international programs are most interested in developing programs abroad that do not require proficiency in a foreign language (e.g., a semester in London). If you have such an office on campus, I suggest that you work with it to design a foreign-language-based

program that meets the specific needs of your students. They will probably welcome your involvement, not only in creating such programs but also in administering and recruiting students to participate in them. Cooperation of this sort can prove mutually beneficial.

3) **Should we create our own program(s) abroad or affiliate with another institution?** There are advantages to both approaches. I would advise you to go it alone if you can possibly manage it, but this may not be feasible unless you have a large body of students eager to study abroad and strong financial support at the outset. If you cannot develop your own program(s), I recommend that you approach a few other institutions similar to yours and try to enter into a cooperative arrangement. This approach is definitely better than sending your students abroad on programs sponsored by other universities or non-profit institutions. Be aware that some institutions are in the business of study abroad to make a profit, and steer your students away from those programs.

4) **Not all students on our campus who want to study abroad can afford to do so. Isn't this a problem?** It should be less expensive for your students to participate in a program abroad sponsored by your institution than in one that is run by another institution. When designing a study abroad program, try to keep the total expense of instruction, room, and board close to what students would expect to pay on your own campus. The added cost of transportation abroad, group excursions, cultural activities, and personal travel may put your program beyond the reach of some students. For that reason, a good scholarship program based on financial need as well as on merit is essential to the success of programs you offer abroad. Your institution should strive to enable all qualified students to participate in its own study abroad programs at a cost comparable to what would be charged for a similar period of study on the home campus.

5) **If we establish programs abroad, our institution will lose valuable tuition revenue. How can we address this problem?** The lost-tuition argument is a favorite with administrators, especially budget officers, who oppose the development of study abroad programs for financial reasons. In addition to explaining

the many benefits of study abroad to them, ask them to try to view your program(s) abroad as an extension of the domestic educational enterprise, i.e., as your institution's campus on foreign soil. Also, be sure to point out that the students who want to study abroad can take a leave of absence and participate in a program sponsored by another institution. In this instance, their tuition revenue would also be lost. Finally, you can recommend that your institution simply admit more incoming students to compensate for the number that will be studying abroad. Keep in mind that it is easier to make such adjustments in admissions for the fall semester.

6) **Several of our faculty members are interested in directing a program abroad, but many are not. Can this become a problem?** If you develop short-term programs that run for about a month during the summer or a winter session, you should be able to find faculty members who are willing to serve as director each year. It is far more difficult to find faculty members, year after year, who will be willing to commit an entire semester to directing a program abroad. For a number of professional, personal, and financial reasons, this form of service is very difficult for many faculty members to perform. Therefore, if you decide to establish a full-semester program, it would be best not to plan on using faculty members from your department or institution as directors—at least not on a regular basis. Finally, a word of caution regarding faculty directors. When selecting a director for any program abroad, make certain that the individual you choose understands what the job entails and what is expected. You will discover that some faculty members may view this period abroad as an opportunity to do research or as a paid vacation. If the director does not take his/her responsibilities seriously, you can expect lots of problems—programmatic, legal, and otherwise.

7) **We need additional information before deciding whether or not to develop our own study abroad programs. How can we get it?** If you want more information on the programs my department sponsors, we will gladly send you copies of the brochures, fliers, and other printed materials we use for publicity purposes. Direct your request to: Study Abroad Coordinator, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, 326 Smith Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716. I refer you also

to the following publication, which contains a wealth of useful information on study abroad programs: Craufurd D. Goodwin and Michael Nacht, *Abroad and Beyond: Patterns in American Overseas Education,* Cambridge University Press, 1988.

CHAPTER 22

Academic and Career Advising for Foreign Language Majors and Minors

---

Catherine R. Perricone
Lafayette College

The analysis and suggestions which follow are based on six years of experience as department head at both a large land-grant university and at a private liberal arts college as well as twenty-seven years of teaching at the college level.

Before examining the question of how to advise undergraduate students, it is useful to look first at how foreign language professors view their own discipline. One assumes that they consider it a significant part of higher education, although it must be stated that some professors do not believe it should be a curricular requirement for all students. Generally, professors are convinced of the value of foreign language study and have offered a number of reasons as to why they think their discipline is relevant and important in academic career advising.

Professors believe that their discipline is germane and pertinent to academic advising based on the premise that foreign language enhances a liberal arts degree, while providing a cultural background useful for life. With this in mind, professors then strongly advise their students to major or minor in a foreign language. Where possible, students are encouraged to have a double major with a complementary area such as history, political science, or anthropology to increase the cultural base for whatever profession or occupation they may choose. Similarly, advisers encourage students to follow a special major with a foreign language component or, as permitted, to design their own major including the study of one or more foreign languages. They further encourage foreign language study for students who plan to get a graduate degree either in a foreign language or some other field which requires a good knowledge of another tongue.

From an academic perspective, therefore, professors have a great deal to say about why students should study a foreign language. To make it more "relevant," however, to students and their parents, and frequently to professors in other disciplines, they must also address the question of career advising.

There seems to be a consensus among professors, whether they subscribe to the "career" value or not of foreign languages, that the rigor of this discipline is helpful in a large number of professions or occupations. Others, convinced of the pragmatic side of foreign language, hold that the major is advantageous in a number of positions in the "real world," and that for many jobs, it is the indispensable condition for obtaining employment.

Both theoretically and pragmatically, professors are generally convinced that academic and career advising for foreign language majors and minors is necessary and crucial for the successful completion of a college degree, but what do students think about all of this?

There are some students who come to college already convinced of the importance of foreign languages for their academic and career plans, largely as a result of the advice and counseling of a high school teacher, counselor, or informed parents. Unfortunately, many students come with some very unrealistic or uninformed perceptions regarding what the study of foreign languages in college entails, what it means to their academic program, or what it signifies for their future career. It sometimes happens that students really want to major in a foreign language, but their parents do not see any practical value in such a degree. It is incumbent upon professors to meet this challenge, and the others cited above, by very adroit advising that can help convince students—and their parents—of the relevance of foreign languages.

The first item to remember is that advising *does not* begin within a department of foreign languages but in brochures published by the

Office of Admissions or Student Services. Optimally, the department will have written the text. A carefully drafted brochure will help attract the kind of students to your college or university who may have either very strong or incipient interest in the study of foreign languages. The brochure should do more than just list courses and professors' names, degrees, and teaching and research interests; rather it should outline the value of majoring or minoring in languages. The adviser's task will be facilitated by this initial communication. Where applicable, usually in small liberal arts colleges, language professors should also assist in the recruitment process, both on and off campus, as this effort will also help to diminish the work involved in advising students on language study. Once freshmen are on campus, the department should do counseling either directly or through appointed advisers during Freshman Orientation, in which they encourage students either to continue the study of a language or begin another one. In this way, should students decide to major or minor in the discipline, they will have sufficient time to do so.

To ensure that all students receive the same basic information about majoring or minoring in foreign languages, the department should have its own handbook, if there is not a college-wide publication, giving in detail all the requirements for a major and minor. Although this may be viewed as a repetition of what is already in the college catalog, experience shows that professors and students are far more likely to consult a small document rather than plow through a catalog. Also, the departmental handbook contains a lot of practical information which does not appear in the catalog, such as professors' office and telephone numbers, variations on the major and minor; and it is usually much more current than catalogs which have to be published earlier in the year before new courses or even new curricula may have been approved.

Enthusiastic and informed departmental advising is the *sine qua non* of successfully directing students in the study of foreign languages. Why should enthusiasm be listed as an essential component in advising? If the professor does not appear to be interested in having a student study a foreign language, the student is going to be disturbed and wonder if she/he should have a major or minor in this area. If the student does not have an appointment and it is really impossible to see advisers on a "drop in" basis, then professors should arrange an appointment which will give sufficient time to discuss at length what the requirements are, and what the benefits are likely to be in pursuing this field of study.

The student should receive undivided attention during the advising session. If possible, do not answer the telephone. Consider the importance of what you are doing. It is not an exaggeration to state that how you advise students can determine their subsequent academic and professional careers. While professors are convinced of the educational value of a foreign language major or minor, most students just want to know "what can I do with this major or minor after I graduate?" Before outlining the academic requirements of the student's plan of study, answer the question on the practicality of such a major or minor. Tell the student that there are career opportunities in the broad fields of trade, business, banking, government, education, medicine, law, and law enforcement, as well as in a number of specialized professions found in the travel industry, journalism, communication, or translating and interpreting. Students will usually have some idea by the end of their sophomore year (when they usually must declare their major) as to their general area of interest. Once you know this, give specific examples of how they can utilize their linguistic skills and their knowledge of foreign cultures and literatures. For example, if they are interested in business or trade, tell them about American firms which have international divisions. (The university's Career Placement Office may be of assistance in this area.) Tell students to be realistic in their expectations, that they may have to work in a company for an unspecified amount of time before they use their linguistic skills either in the U. S. or abroad, and that this serves as a transitional period when they are learning how the company operates. What seems obvious to professors is not so to students, who frequently expect immediate returns on the undergraduate major (or "investment," as their parents may call it). The department could render a valuable service to students interested in business and trade if it compiled a list of international firms in their area. This list would be particularly beneficial to those departments which have international trade/foreign language majors and are in a metropolitan area where internships might be available.

If students are interested in a career in government, stress that there are numerous possibilities, especially in civil service jobs, but that graduate work would enhance their opportunities, particularly if they wanted to work abroad in the diplomatic corps. Should this be their goal, then recommend a number of graduate programs which would give them the kind of background they need. On the other hand, for those who have the B.A. degree, mention that there are a number of job opportunities in state and local government, in health, education, social work, and law enforcement which require foreign language capabilities.

For those students wishing a career in teaching, ask them which level—elementary, secondary, or college—and then advise them accordingly. If they are interested in elementary and secondary education, after describing the curriculum in language, put them in contact with the institution's Education Department, as they will have to take certain Education courses and have a teaching internship in order to be certified to teach. Of course, if they wish to teach in college, describe what is required in graduate school and *afterward*, that is, their responsibilities in teaching, research/publication, and service or extension. These are several examples of interests which students may express in future careers, but the point is that once they have indicated their general area of interest, advisers should draw them a realistic picture of what to expect in the job market.

Depending on the way a college or university operates, professors may have freshmen or sophomore advisees who are still in a general or core curriculum who have either never thought about studying foreign languages or who have already decided on another major. This nevertheless offers a great opportunity to the enthusiastic and interested faculty member to show that students could have even greater career opportunities or might be more effective in their careers if they know a foreign language. For example, suppose someone has decided to become a physician. She or he would be able to meet the needs of many non-English-speaking patients. Attorneys can expand their clientele with knowledge of another language and culture. For those who are majoring in history, music, art, anthropology, religion, or philosophy, at least a minor in a foreign language would be of great benefit, a fact which needs to be spelled out for students. Others who are majoring in political science can be encouraged to double major or to take as many courses as possible in a foreign language. For example, indicate how knowledge of a foreign language is essential in certain areas, or that if they wish to understand the current political scene, it is extremely beneficial to be able to watch international TV programs or read foreign newspapers. Science majors should be encouraged to study a foreign language since some of them will pursue graduate study and will need to do research with scientists abroad. Those who plan to teach in one discipline will find that in some instances their skills are more marketable if they can also teach a foreign language.

In summary, once students have indicated their general interests which normally involve the study of a foreign language or their desire to major in a subject not immediately connected with foreign language study, give specific examples as to how the major or minor in one or more foreign languages would help them to achieve their career plans. Then very carefully outline a plan of study which will assist them in securing a degree in a reasonable amount of time. Where a double major or a major in another area is involved, it is essential to consult with a member of the other department.

Curriculum planning is essential for providing students with the kinds of courses they need to meet academic and career goals and helps to ensure the integrity of the advising process. In other words, if we are encouraging the study of foreign languages, then we have to be sure that we are giving the students the educational experience which will serve them in their academic and professional careers. Curricular development should be an ongoing activity within the department, and while students should not dictate what is taught, their input on course needs should be considered by the faculty.

Department heads should exercise extreme care in selecting advisers for majors and minors. They should be "enthusiastic" and "informed" faculty, as noted previously. In those departments which assign one person as adviser for a given language section, it is a grave injustice to burden new faculty members with this time-consuming responsibility. In fact, departments may wish to rethink how to best advise their majors and minors. One possible solution would be to divide the majors equally among experienced faculty members. Assigning the right people as advisers is a task requiring tact and diplomacy and can make or break a department. New tenure-track faculty may not achieve tenure unless enrollment justifies institutional investments in a permanent position, and tenured faculty may be judged by the administration for salary increases based partly on effectiveness in student advising. Selected faculty must be as convinced of the importance of proper and careful advising as they are of the significance of foreign language study. They must be disposed to give students the time they deserve by listening to them and guiding them towards meaningful academic and career goals.

The important task of advising can be facilitated if the department head in collaboration with the faculty has an up-to-date handbook listing not only the major/minor requirements but also internship possibilities (location and availability), and as complete a list as possible of the variety of jobs and professions (addresses of employers) requiring foreign language either as an essential prerequisite or as a useful supplementary skill.

Many students are already required to take a foreign language because of some curricular requirement or occupational objective. There is ample evidence that if students have a good learning experience in the foreign language classroom they will continue their study of the language. In many instances they will even change their major to foreign languages!

CHAPTER 23

The Chair and Collective Bargaining

Juan C. Zamora
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

The title of this chapter is somewhat deceiving in that a department chair does not normally take part in *collective bargaining*; that is done at the highest level of administration (president or chancellor's office) or by the board of trustees. However, once collective bargaining has resulted in a contract, the chair does have to function taking into account the contract, and situations will arise where he or she must deal with union representatives. These dealings may be affected by the fact that, depending on the institution, the chair may or may not be a member of the union. In my own university, heads and chairs voted against belonging to the union, but the margin was less than 1%, so it could very easily have gone the other way. If the vote were taken again today, I cannot guess how it would go.

However one may feel about unions in general, about unionization of faculties, or about the particular union in one's institution, one must always keep in mind that the majority of the faculty voted in the union and approved the collective bargaining contract. One should also consider that most faculties, I believe, are not naturally inclined towards unionization; in fact, I also believe, most are originally against it. The union and contract with which the chair must deal exist because some action or actions of the university or college administration (or, in state universities and colleges, of the legislature or the governor) made the faculty believe that protection against a prevailing situation was absolutely necessary and that most members of the faculty still feel the same way. Therefore, a large number of the chair's colleagues in the department generally favor the union, and, incidentally, when the chair leaves that position, she or he will join, or rejoin, the union.

Most chairs of departments in institutions where the faculty is unionized, and in some where it is not, may have to deal with other unions and collective bargaining contracts. Administrative assistants (if the department has any) and clerical staff also may be unionized. In my university, graduate teaching and research assistants voted for union representation, and I must take into account their agreement with the administration. I will say something about these other situations later, but the major part of this chapter will be concerned with how the *faculty* union and contract affect actions by the chair.

Union contracts will deal essentially with personnel actions and working conditions; consideration of Affirmative Action will usually be included in all cases. Personnel actions include:

1) Recruiting and hiring, including much detail about the search. This is one of the areas less dealt with by most collective bargaining agreements, since those being recruited are not yet members of the union. Institutional regulations do apply because of Affirmative Action reporting requirements.

2) Contract renewal or non-renewal, including formal requirements of notification, deadlines, and reasons (if negative).

3) Promotion and tenure, or denial, with all the considerations of notification, etc., given above.

4) Termination of those under contract or protected by tenure, also with all the above considerations.

5) Reprimand or censure, particularly if these lead to suspension or to negative documents appearing in the personnel file.

Items 2 through 5 will merit extensive consideration in any collective bargaining contract, obviously because they affect union members. The contract will describe in detail all procedures, and the chair must be sure to follow carefully all procedural requirements. Related to all of the above (also included in collective bargaining agreements) are questions concerning personnel files: what can or cannot be included, access by the faculty member, etc.

Merit and other personnel recommendations made by a personnel committee elected by faculty (i.e., union members) are usually not grievable; the same logically applies to recommendations by the chair that concur. If the personnel committee is not elected by union members or if its composition is not determined by them, procedures will be specified in the collective bargaining agreement. The chair must make sure that procedures are followed or at least point out the failure of committees or individuals to do so, in a recommendation.

The following are some other possible problems, related mostly to working conditions, that are normally included in collective bargaining agreements:

1) Scheduling, including days per week and class hours, number of preparations, subject matter, and teaching load.
2) Office assignments.
3) Service, especially assignment or not to one or another committee, or a load perceived as heavy.
4) Research related matters.

All of these and similar questions may be reason for grievance if there is a deviation from departmental practice, or if perceived differences in treatment of colleagues are seen as resulting from discrimination or from unfair judgment of relative qualifications of colleagues. Collective bargaining agreements will give more weight to deviation from past practice, because comparing colleagues means pitting one union member against another.

Personnel matters and working conditions have always been a part of the by-laws or rules of a university or college, even if there is no collective bargaining agreement. In most institutions some kind of grievance procedure exists, as well as a determination of who hears and who decides the grievance, whether the faculty is unionized or not. It could not be any other way; human beings will always, at one time or another, feel that they have been the victims of inequity, discrimination, favoritism, or abuse of power, and institutions must provide ways of resolving these real or perceived problems. However, where there is a collective bargaining agreement, the administration will tighten its rules and be much more specific about form and procedure as well as about more substantive matters. A collective bargaining agreement will result in *the administration's* increasing the paperwork and procedural requirements with which the chair has to deal. These are in addition to the increased load in the same areas imposed on the chair by the agreement itself. Substantive matters will not change much, however, because areas of concern for faculty, which the administration had to deal with in one way or another even before unionization, will be the same after the faculty unionizes.

One of the **cons** of collective bargaining is the unquestionable increase of work for the chair. The **pro** is that problems will be better identified, and requirements will be more specific; i.e., the degree of uncertainty in the chair's job will be reduced. Vagueness, which is always a problem for decision makers, will diminish.

If the faculty is unionized, it is almost certain that clerical staff will also be under a collective bargaining agreement. It may happen, however, that there is not a faculty union but that there is a staff union, so that the chair will still have to deal with a collective bargaining agreement.

There are, of course, major differences between dealing with faculty and with staff, although there are also similarities. These differences and similarities will hold whether or not there is a collective bargaining agreement. Faculty can achieve tenure, staff cannot. However, in most state universities or colleges the staff will most probably be under *civil service*, which in some aspects is not too different from tenure. And the need to know two sets of regulations, one from the university or college, another from the collective bargaining agreement, (and the procedural requirements in each case) would be basically similar for faculty and staff agreements.

The major differences would arise from the possible sources of grievance. Obviously classroom assignments, assignment of number, type, or level of classes, and research-related matters will not apply. The relationship to union representatives (shop stewards) will also be different. When dealing with a representative of the faculty union, you are dealing with a colleague, or someone who represents colleagues; but the representative of the staff will be a colleague of the staff members, never of the chair. In any case, knowing the rules (grounds and remedies for grievances), adhering strictly to procedure (including notification and deadline requirements), thorough documentation, and a good dose of patience (procedures move at a much slower pace than one would desire or find reasonable), are the keys to success in dealing with staff collective bargaining agreement situations.

Dealing with unions representing teaching or research assistants is a problem limited to institutions and departments with major graduate programs. In any case, unionization at this level is only now beginning, and there are very few universities where it exists. One could argue that if it is now developing, it is only because labor unions are trying to make up for enormous membership losses in industry and commerce. It could also be said that since assistantships are given as a subsidy for graduate study, and because of the necessarily transitory nature of the assistantships, unions are not justified. One probably would be right, but as I said before, if unionization succeeds it usually is because the administration has created a situation where the assistants feel that they have legitimate, serious grievances. Relations between graduate assistants and individual departments will seldom be a cause for unionization. Although the chair has to deal with the problem, one shouldn't take it personally if it happens during one's tenure as chair.

I had to deal with the creation of a graduate assistants' union in my institution and with a collective bargaining agreement related to them. Honestly, I must admit that I was somewhat worried about the change in the relationship with graduate students who also happened to be teaching assistants. Frankly, very little has changed, except my workload and that of the clerical staff. Everything that has been said before about acquiring knowledge of the new contract and about being careful to adhere strictly to its procedural requirements holds.

Since there are pros and cons to everything, there obviously will be advantages and disadvantages for a chair dealing with one or more collective bargaining agreements. Some of them have been mentioned before, but I will summarize them below and add a couple:

> **PROS.** From the point of view of each of the constituencies (faculty, staff, graduate assistants) there certainly will be others; from the perspective of the department chair I can see only one: substantive and procedural matters will be more clearly spelled out, making at least one aspect of the chair's job easier.
>
> **CONS.** 1) The chair's load will be increased by the need to be familiar with more rules and regulations, and the paper work will increase. 2) All procedures will be more time consuming, and required change will take longer to implement. 3) The faculty union's usual opposition to merit and its insistence in always providing assistance to membership, even when the union representative privately admits that the member is clearly wrong, can be a cause for aggravation. 4) In the case of staff unions, inflexibility about job description and work rules can also be

aggravating to a chair (or faculty member) trying to conduct the business of education, i.e., teaching and research.

In summary, a chair may work somewhat **more** under contract terms of a collective bargaining agreement, but those terms minimally affect the nature of the task at hand, at least as I see it.

CHAPTER 24

Teaching and Research in Institutions Large and Small

Marie Adele Wellington
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Current concern about the quality of American education at all levels makes reflection on the matter of teaching and research in the foreign language department particularly timely, but it is a topic that long has claimed serious consideration on the part of foreign language educators. Since every departmental situation requires careful study of its own unique combination of circumstances, it would be unrealistic to aspire to offer observations applicable to each one. What follows is therefore a series of remarks inspired by many years' experience in the field as teacher, researcher, and head of a department as well as by an untold number of professional contacts and sometimes passionate discussions with administrators, colleagues, students, and parents.

An institution's central administration plays a key role in the establishment of any foreign language department's framework, in the formulation of its purpose, and in the shaping of its faculty. In many undergraduate institutions, the foreign language department does not enjoy a position of priority in the minds of the administrators, who not uncommonly envision it to be primarily a service department offering first- and second-year language courses designed for the fulfillment of graduation requirements. Successful candidates for positions in such a department are most often those whose commitment is to teaching and who, if they have research interests, are willing to greatly subordinate or abandon them in response to heavy teaching loads. Departmental frameworks of this kind are not likely to attract research scholars with high expectations regarding salary and free time and low expectations regarding teaching load and correlative assignments. It follows that the one heading the foreign language department must guide the faculty in the development of a sequence of courses that conforms not only to the resources residing in the personnel but also to the function of the department as conceived and supported financially and philosophically by the institution's administrative officers in accord with the established institutional goals.

The formulation of a clear expression of the mission of the foreign language department is of vital importance not only to the department but to the institution at large. It promotes in the foreign language faculty a sense of common purpose and defines for their colleagues the nature of their endeavor. In a department whose faculty are supportive of a common purpose there is opportunity for the development of a spirit of cooperation that facilitates the finding of solutions to problems that arise, whether they involve curriculum, staffing, course assignments, scheduling, or the performance of correlative duties. A department whose members are unclear about its mission projects an image of a faculty whose members are directed by their individual concerns and preferences with little interest in the consequences for their students. A fragmented program resulting from lack of focus on the part of a department's faculty is limited in its potential for effectiveness in serving students.

In addition to classroom teaching and research, the possibilities for faculty contributions to the functioning of a foreign language department are dictated by its character and aims and include chairing the department; assisting, counseling, and advising students; serving on committees; and, where appropriate, supervising student teachers and overseeing foreign study programs. There is cause to question the wisdom of assuming that all members of the department have comparable capabilities for serving in each of these areas. One sensible approach is the assignment of duties based on the interests, the professional training and experience, and the personal qualifications of the individual members of the department, with care being taken not to overload with responsibilities those who are most willing and dependable. A corollary to this is the need to encourage appreciation of the value of the various kinds of contributions, an attitude of respect for those who render them in a creditable manner, and recognition for competent and responsible performance of them in the form of salary, promotion, and tenure.

If the complicated matters of the presence or the absence of departmental and institutional requirements for research and the inevitability of the rendering of administrative judgments based on faculty accomplishments are abstracted from the question of relationships between teaching and research, an underlying question remains: Why engage in research? Logically, answers to this question must deal with effects that research activity has on the faculty member and on students in the foreign language department.

It is axiomatic that an effective teacher is one who exhibits to students an active interest in the teaching-learning enterprise. Engaging in research activities is, on one hand, an expression of enthusiasm for the business of teaching and for the subject to be taught and, on the other hand, an important resource for the sustenance of that enthusiasm. Whether or not programs of research are directly related to a teacher's course assignments, whether or not students are aware of a teacher's research interest and involvement in writing and publishing on topics connected to the pertinent teaching field, the intellectual commitment that these activities represent can hardly fail to be communicated to students in the classroom as an indication that the study of foreign language is an important and worthwhile pursuit apart from any place that it may have in the area of graduation requirements.

In the foreign language department in a four-year, liberal arts college that does not place research and publishing requirements on its faculty, the priority given to teaching and related or auxiliary instructional tasks may be so strong as to place research in the position of being viewed as not germane to the work of the department and therefore of questionable value. Administrative indifference is frequently evidenced by a failure to have a salary structure designed to make upward adjustment possible as recognition of professional achievements of a research nature or even to have a policy of expressing commendation in oral or written form. In such circumstances, only the most highly motivated faculty members are likely to devote themselves significantly to research and writing, while the majority are deterred by time constraints or a preference for personal and family pursuits.

If the mission of a foreign language department whose priority has been teaching is modified to include support and recognition for faculty achievements in the area of research, adjustments are in order with regard to attitudes, expectations, and course loads as well as policies dealing with salary, promotion, and tenure. There is a strong possibility that tenured faculty members for whom research has not been a factor in their employment will find the change in the department's orientation to be unsettling or even threatening. Justice requires the continued utilization of those capabilities as teachers for which such professors were employed, encouragement of whatever latent talents and inclinations they may have with respect to research work, and recognition in the form of salary and promotion commensurate to their special contributions to the conduct of the department and unprejudiced by research and publishing requirements imposed subsequent to their being granted tenure. Non-tenured faculty should receive comparable consideration, with decisions regarding their futures being based to a large extent on the following: the evolving needs of the department, their own professional goals and expectations, and the roles that the faculty will need to play in meeting whatever challenges may derive from the transition that the department has undertaken.

An institution that requires research and publishing of members of the foreign language department should be mindful of its responsibility to provide practical and material facilities as well as an appropriate intellectual climate supportive of such activity. To the research scholar, particularly one in a system in which three or four courses per semester constitute the norm, a reduced teaching load is a highly valued perquisite. The work of investigation and writing is further encouraged by the availability of a personal computer, free or inexpensive photocopying privileges, a well-stocked research library, and an interlibrary loan system that serves the faculty with promptness and accuracy.

In the area of policy, a department in which research activities and publishing records weigh heavily in the process by which decisions are made with regard to salary, promotion, and tenure must deal with two central faculty concerns: the matter of quantitative requirements in terms of the numbers of articles or books that a candidate must present and the matter of the procedure for rendering qualitative judgments of those materials. There is, of course, no way to ensure either absolute fairness or even the appearance of it in all cases, but measures can be taken to foster in the department feelings of trust and understanding rather than doubt and misgivings. When quantitative requirements are openly stated, faculty members are not kept in a state of anxiety over the unknown, nor does the evidence allow for debate. Qualitative judgments ideally should be made in accord with informed professional standards uncolored by biases relative to ideology, methodology, or critical theory, and purposeful efforts should be made to ensure the closest possible approach to these standards. In a department whose members have patently limited knowledge of a given area of research, there may be agreement that publication of research articles in that area, or their acceptance for publication, in reputable, refereed journals should serve as decisive evidence in the evaluative process. In any event, it should be the intent of all concerned to avoid damaging the academic career of any faculty member through decisions dictated by prejudice; by lack of the necessary familiarity with the individual's field of specialization; by unprofessional procedures; and by adherence to evaluative norms based on fads in literary criticism that are narrow in scope, that are politicized or activist in nature, and that reject as unworthy or invalid research that deals with uncategorical themes.

Whether recently adopted or long established, administrative expectations relative to research and publishing can have a divisive effect on a foreign language department. It is understandable that faculty members in a department in transition might view preferential treatment accorded by an institution's administration to publishing scholars as an implicit judgment that instruction is less worthy than research. Faculty members who are unproductive or only mildly productive as research scholars may be moved to resentment over having to assume heavier teaching loads than recognized research scholars, especially if they have research ambitions of their own and feel trapped in a system which, by virtue of the limitations that it places on their free time, frustrates their efforts to achieve them. Not to be overlooked either is the fact that enjoyment of a favored position in a foreign language department is known to have the power to engender arrogance and feelings of superiority in research scholars who allow themselves to lose sight of the indispensable contributions to the field that are made by competent, creative, dedicated, and hard-working teachers.

The foreign language department, particularly that of a large university with a graduate program, may allow itself to become organized to work at cross purposes, with teaching requirements and research expectations in unrelenting competition for the time, energy, and abilities of its faculty members. A situation of this kind is conducive to the adoption of procedures that bring discredit to the institution and may be described as abuses by members of the instructional staff, by students, and by informed, knowledgeable parents. Who has not known or heard of the driven research scholar who depends on class discussions to disguise lack of preparation or professional inadequacies, or the one who grades term papers following a superficial review and returns them without comments, thereby limiting their educational value to the students, or the one who is frequently absent from class or seminar meetings and therefore unavailable to give the most basic instruction to which enrolled students are entitled?

In a university foreign language department with a graduate program where research and publishing requirements are high and teaching assignments for full-time faculty members with the Ph.D. are realistically adjusted to support those requirements, first- and second-year language courses may be taught exclusively by graduate students who may or may not be qualified in terms of mastery of the foreign language or of appropriate instructional techniques. Poorly qualified graduate assistants weaken an undergraduate program, serving to discourage able students from pursuing upper-level courses and making it necessary for instructional goals in the latter courses to be less ambitious than they could be if enrollees were better prepared. A graduate program built on such a base may very well develop courses in which substance and challenge are compromised to accommodate candidates whose concepts of grammar, idiomatic usage, and sentence structure have been ill-formed and who therefore are lacking in appreciation of the intricacies of literary form and modes of expression. The need of such candidates for remedial language studies may be obvious to them as well as to their graduate professors, but the possibility that the need will be met is slight. Even when motivated to deal with it, few graduate students are equipped to devise and realize a program of study to raise their own linguistic capabilities to a more satisfactory level. Furthermore, many professors, especially those under pressure for research and publishing, are wont to adopt instructional approaches that permit them to gloss over students' linguistic deficiencies, eschewing the time-consuming correction of errors in the use of the foreign language in written essays or avoiding the issue entirely by accepting papers written in English.

The following factual case illustrates some of the possible consequences of such program development. A young woman who holds an M.A. in a foreign language from a state university enrolls in a liberal arts college for the purpose of earning a secondary teaching certificate in her chosen language. In order to receive permission to undertake student teaching, she is required to complete successfully a course in advanced conversation, composition, and grammar in that language. After doing so, she announces that for the first time she knows what she is doing in the use of the language and is no longer fearful of beginning to teach it. One is dismayed by the thought that someone like this young lady, with only the M.A. in hand and capable of no more than an uncertain contribution to the instructional program of lower-level language courses, might become a graduate assistant assigned to fulfill teaching responsibilities with minimal guidance, or might be employed to teach at an undergraduate institution. Whether or not the students involved were interested only in fulfilling a graduation requirement in foreign language or were intending to pursue a major in the language and then do graduate studies in language and literature, they would be entitled to more competent instruction than this kind of teacher could provide. As for informed and concerned parents investing financially and otherwise in the academic preparation of the young people taught by a like person in either of these two situations, they would be justified not only in expecting the institution to offer better instruction than such an individual could deliver but also in seeking it elsewhere upon discovering the instructional inadequacies being countenanced.

Whatever relationship between teaching and research is established in a foreign language department, no commitment to research by its members can warrant neglect of its responsibility to provide the highest level of instructional services within its capabilities as circumscribed by the institution's financial resources, philosophy of education, and facilities. Working within its institutional framework, a foreign language department develops its strength through its selection and utilization of its faculty members and its attraction and guidance of students. The department is well-served if it operates on the principle that, whether they are native speakers of the foreign language or not, its teachers of elementary and intermediate language courses should have in-depth knowledge of the language and be able as well as willing to give their students clear explanations of grammar and structure. This task has become increasingly challenging as more and more programs in English at the grade school, high school, and college or university levels have de-emphasized structural aspects of language study while foreign language requirements for graduation from colleges and universities have been routinely reduced from two years to one year and a half or one year. The department is also well-served when it takes measures that foster the success of its students through attention to their individual needs. One of the most useful and beneficial of these measures is the administration of placement tests to all in-coming students who want or are required to take sequential courses in a given language. In this way, disparities in previous foreign language instruction can be accommodated without the arbitrary placement of students in courses for which they may be poorly prepared and from which they are therefore almost certain to derive minimum educational profits while suffering a sense of failure. Even when there is a question of the loss of some transfer credit through repetition of lower-level courses, serious students of the chosen language are unlikely to resist taking advantage of an opportunity to enhance their competency. Once they have done so, advanced courses may have greater appeal for them, and some may ultimately major in the area. If there is resistance, enrollment in a beginning course in an alternate language is an option that holds more promise of success. Finally, judicious use of placement tests makes possible the formation of classes in which the progress of students who are prepared to perform at the required level is not hampered by the teacher's need to give undue attention to those who are not.

In summary, the evolution of each foreign language department is affected by a specific combination of circumstances and conditions. The majority of these are results of the philosophical positions, the vision, and the directional actions of the institution's administrators. Working under the constraints imposed by the institution's goals, facilities, and educational orientation, the head of the foreign language department and its faculty have responsibility for fashioning a suitable instructional program, seeking a feasible balance between teaching and research, and establishing modes of procedure that are implemented with professionalism, honesty, and integrity.

CHAPTER 25

Public Relations: Evolving into the "We-Care Attitude of Action"

Barbara Crockett Dease
Spelman College

The Way We Were

1) Too involved in structurally counting the number of times Balzac used the imperfect tense in his *Comédie Humaine*!

2) So literarily involved as products of past literature curricula that we resented methods courses (because who needs to learn how to teach?)!

3) So separatist in doctrine that the literature coming from formerly colonized countries was barely recognized as valid and worthwhile! Nor did we want to publish anywhere except *PMLA*!

4) So positive that others knew our true worth that we did not bother to sell ourselves!

The way we were is really wasted nostalgia! Was the way it was and the way we were so like Eden that there is reason to perpetuate it? Or was the way we were similar to the past definite or the definite past?

The Way We Are

Today, we accept the reality that we live in a nation which has a philosophy that follows the "Big Green" rather than "Big Brains," one which emphasized *how* one says something, and not *what* one says. Acceptance of this theory is like a *prise de conscience* to most foreign language personnel, for it causes a reverse point of view to dominate our thoughts. However, it will not be necessary to abandon totally our purist philosophies if we incorporate the above reality with what is called "an attitude of action," or better still, a "we-care attitude of action." Action in language departments need not necessarily hinge on the crass impersonal views of big business. As long as we remember that students and people will receive the benefits of our actions, we can remain the indomitable *porte-parole* of our campus society and retain clean consciences while exhibiting an attitude of *engagement*.

This chapter will address how to achieve the "we-care attitude of action" through 1) utilizing public relations to promote programs, 2) involving departmental personnel to help in these endeavors, and 3) demonstrating methods of community involvement to help take our message to the public. There are still locations which strongly resist this message in which we believe so strongly, and the last section of the chapter is for situations which may require hard-core political action. Throughout, ideas and attitudes (or changes of attitudes) are presented for their impact on the public, for it is through this nebulous and changeable public that we seek to eternalize our message, not just in academia, but in the community as a whole.

Even today, when every other word is "global," "international," or "foreign," because of our abysmal ignorance and backward attitudes toward all things not American, we chairs of language departments must exhibit an attitude of action by becoming our own public relations agent. This extra responsibility is a non-paying facet of the job as department chair, though it can reap benefits faster than others when applied correctly. It is also the part of our job for which we are usually least prepared, for no doctorate in foreign languages incorporates a course in PR 101 as a requirement. Not only must we become skilled, but we must also then pass these skills and attitudes on to our departmental faculty and staff. Notwithstanding the baptisms of fire which we unskilled laborers of public relations must undergo, our reputations as trustworthy PR practitioners must be earned and recognized, at least by the campus and local newspeople.

Promoting a renewed "we-care attitude of action" within the foreign language department comes in many forms and uses many different skills, talents, and types of knowledge. Not promoting ourselves could result, sooner than later, in fewer FTEs, lack of recognition as a viable and productive department, in-house trouble with such obviously powerful entities as the Curriculum Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and being overlooked by Powers-That-Be controlling funding and budgets. Being scholarly types, we tend to shy away from publicity and to underrate public relations, preferring to follow the outdated dictum of our precursors: "If it is worthwhile, others will recognize and publicize it." Today, that is the equivalent of the ostrich's head-in-the-sand attitude, and, just like the ostrich, the world and many possibilities pass over us, perhaps to haunt us later.

On the other hand, the bull-in-the-china-shop approach to PR is just as disadvantageous, unless we happen to be a John Rassias with the Midas gift. Newspeople have predilections just as we do, and ignorance of them will be as detrimental as ignoring the media. Hopefully, the sacred cows mentioned below will help shape or re-shape our perspectives on promotion of resources and publicity of our productivity.

The first step for a chair intent on formulating a "we-care attitude of action" is the assessment and organizational stage. It is critical to determine, in the present departmental set-up, which characteristics and aspects will be productive or counter-productive, which to cultivate, and which to downplay or ignore. One must determine the strengths and weaknesses of the department and its members, ascertaining individuals' skills and talents within and especially outside the academic realm. Equally important are their attitudes toward action, levels of energy, and depth of outside knowledge. If the decision is made to "go public," the chair cannot and should not be expected to go it alone, thus making it essential to know when and to whom to turn for help.

For instance, one instructor's advanced knowledge of computer programs would come in very handy, especially the skill in making different kinds of eye-catching graphics, tables, and charts. Such products are tailor-made for handouts at programs, press interviews, program reviews, and other functions. Another instructor's attention to detail could cross over into an ability to organize community events. Not every person wants to be in front of the camera. Some shy ones, referred to as the "workhorses," prefer to be involved in production (a nice name for the dirty, time-consuming jobs).

The instructor who has a penchant for research might have the responsibility of identifying and locating potential speakers, keeping track of campus curricular trends, working with statistics for a proposal, or helping to develop speeches and presentations. An instructor with editorial skills should be willing to take charge of a departmental newsletter, thus publicizing the department's programs, majors, and future course offerings. Someone else's musical talent or knowledge would be very helpful in contributing to campus or community programs; another's artistic flair could be put to use in designing and executing posters, brochures, and programs; the one who brags about his/her culinary skills would be responsible for program refreshments or for arranging an annual international campus cookout. Someone with an outrageous gift of gab could be asked to moderate panels or to serve as master of ceremonies at different functions.

Instructors who are also parents with children in elementary, junior, or senior high schools are worth their weight in gold, for they often have personal knowledge of pertinent and current educational data, especially if the department offers teacher training and certification. They can signal the changes needed in relevant courses; they can monitor the effect of foreign language teaching methodologies on their children; they can pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses in overall programs at the schools.

Thus, when it comes to collaborating or going public, there is room for everyone in the department to market his/her skills. Department chairs, knowing their personnel, can involve every member, usually for the betterment of the whole group. One might wonder about the appropriateness of the department's hiring procedures if there is someone for whom no duty or opportunity can be found outside the classroom.

Since we have become more savvy about campus operations and politics and their place in departmental activities, the second step is to assess the university's strengths and weaknesses and how to relate to them in our own efforts toward a rejuvenated attitude of action. Of necessity, this includes knowing the names, functions, and abilities of the administrative and staff personnel and the policies to which they adhere, as well as appropriate factual data, such as deadline information, and who is responsible for signing what, when, and where. Nor does it ever hurt to be on a friendly enough basis with personnel to know their personality quirks and likes/dislikes (though it does not always help for them to know us well enough to know *our* quirks!). Equally important and useful is knowing the kinds of machinery and specialized operations there are on campus, i.e., a printing press and the creativity of its operators, the complexity of the computers, calligraphy experts, and the willingness of PR specialists. It makes no sense to reinvent a wheel that is already housed in another unit on the campus.

The third step is crucial. Many professional organizations (and local promotion and tenure committees) have adopted as an official or unofficial judgmental criterion the track record of a department or individual in developing and writing proposals. At a time when state or private funding is becoming smaller and smaller, many administrators are calling for proposals which are funded from outside sources to augment annual budgets. When it comes to writing proposals of any kind, one must first find out how the administrative staff handles them. Some campuses are very lax and have few rules governing proposal-writing; others have the staff to research and even flesh out ideas brought to them; still others make it competitive, with the best-sounding proposal, or the highest amount of proposed funding, winning the right to be sent off campus. Awareness of appropriate in-house forms and deadlines, research capabilities, and writing expertise is essential.

What is so important about proposals, especially those that have been funded, is that they automatically bring recognition and attendant publicity to authors in academic circles. The higher the funded amount, the more acclaim and attention one receives. In addition, more and more, unfunded and funded proposals are becoming a factor in promotion and tenure procedures, so quite often there is little to lose and much to gain.

While on the subject of proposals with positive results in public relations and exhibiting "we-care attitudes of action," mention must be made of the state humanities councils. Each state has one, and usually they are very active statewide. Proposals to these councils are a good way to begin learning about proposal writing, because the director and his/her staff are usually local and can give immediate and personal feedback to ideas before the first word is written. Humanities councils, by their very nature, limit the gap between town and gown and require off-campus participation and impersonal evaluation. Being a local product and having a local response are essential ingredients for good publicity, so, though the awarded amounts are sometimes small, it is well worth the effort. One way to push well-received action and collaboration in a city or county is through these proposals, for the more interdisciplinary or interdepartmental the idea, the better the chance for funding, not to mention the reduction of the town-gown gap.

It is also vital that we keep abreast of the political climate as it pertains to us and to our subject, not just on the campus, but locally, in the state, regionally, and nationally. We must be acquainted with the latest trends, methods, and especially the buzzwords. It is a good rule of thumb never to underestimate John Q. and Sally Public, for it is much harder (and more embarrassing) to correct an error of underrating than one of overrating.

The fourth step then follows logically: addressing public attitudes through a "we-care attitude of action." It is both effective and impressive with the media and others when one can reel off pertinent statistics and facts. Thus, an in-depth review of the latest information on foreign languages and ancillary fields is necessary. One must also know how these statistics affect the local situation. It is not just enough to apply this knowledge to all levels of education, but relating it to the community's economy and job situation helps to round out a total picture.

With such sound preparation and knowledge, we are now ready to articulate with the public, here defined as news media and different kinds of committees, commissions, and boards. The news media's help consists mainly of public service announcements (PSAs), news releases via press announcements, video news releases, television coverage, and interviews. The words "sound bytes" have become a bread-and-butter expression for TV, where time equals money. Not all of us are proficient in speaking in "byte" language or in producing effective one-liners, but it is something which we can practice and master, since language is our business.

Each of these sacred cows has its own code, rules and regulations, and follow-through. PSAs are free and can be developed to be "ear- or eye-catching" and timely. News releases are effective only if they are carried to the public by some kind of medium. They are often the hardest to get, because of newspeople's differing definitions of what constitutes "news," as well as how much time is available for "freebies."

Video news releases can often become major productions (or major headaches), what with studio space and time, the use of professional media experts (which most campuses have in abundance, even though their priorities may not initially include the language department), finding a presentable narrator-voice, practice time, good actors, etc. They are, however, highly effective if executed with a modicum of professionalism.

Interviews with the press very seldom occur when something good (as opposed to controversial) is being promoted. A very close relationship with the university's PR personnel will help determine if an interview is the most appropriate publicity needed, and they will then help to arrange an interview with the desired media. Indeed, the PR people will offer a great deal of help and wisdom on how to market news. Sometimes, they will appear to be over-zealous and a hindrance, but they usually know their trade and the media better than we do.

It is also very necessary to know the local sources which handle and dispense news, not just the principal TV and radio stations and newspapers, but also the community media, local newssheets, business connections, etc. Local owners and managers of department stores and other large businesses should definitely be cultivated for any future use, whether commercial or noncommercial. Commissions, boards, and organizations, such as the Jaycees, the Optimist Clubs, city and county councils, humanities councils, the Urban League, and others, can very often pave the way for amateur public relations campaigns and provide help in innumerable ways. Professionals refer to this as "building bridges," a tried and true method of closing the town-gown gap.

Most important, not to be forgotten or overlooked, are the personnel of city and county public and private elementary and secondary schools. A working relationship with principals, school board administrators, language teachers, their programs, their ambitions and priorities is vital. This relationship is fairly easy to accomplish in a small college-small community situation, for it is easier to know people. But the same relationships can be achieved in larger cities with the help of foreign language departmental members, especially those who have children in those schools.

The fifth step concerns outreach strategies for colleges and universities. Departmental action is essential for a successful outreach program. Following is a capsulized view of action strategies for departmental faculty: making the department and its languages visible on campus; surveying other departments to ascertain how their students can be helped; impressing top-level administrators with our loyalty, efficiency, and overall worth; psyching the department into becoming a complete and cohesive unit; stressing the belief in interdisciplinarity; recognizing adult or continuing education as an untapped source and offering our knowledge and skills to it; becoming valuable resource persons to the community; actively taking part in national, state, and local concerns which affect us. For university professors, these sorts of activities have nothing to do with degrees and specialties. Anyone versatile enough to teach a language can lead or participate in anything mentioned here. In short, the goal is to become a department sensitive to the needs of all who come in contact with it.

The results of such an attitude of action are not to be underestimated, for they are infectious. No one consciously wants to be left at the gatepost with the upraised dust on his or her face. Usually results are positive and productive, for each ego is stroked and each self is validated because we have consciously reached outside of ourselves to help others.

Individualized attitudinal action is mirrored in the following ideas, mentioned principally for their collective advantage: bringing verve and nerve into the classroom; offering courses for what students really need, not what we would like them to need; writing proposals; branching out into the community with courses to serve wider needs; endeavoring to structure courses for the uncertified high school language teachers; and lastly, actual lobbying on a grand scale, if it comes to that.

Very fertile soil for outreach and collaboration exists in most locales, with stalemates and gaps extant only because parties on both sides maintain the ostrich syndrome. Most often, all that is needed is an opportunity for individuals from different community factions to come together and communicate. Enter a leader, such as the department chair or another *porte-parole*, someone with persuasive powers, a positive attitude, a down-to-earth approach, a wealth of knowledge, and a flair for making things happen. What happens is collaboration, which occurs very naturally when one recognizes and reaches out to at least one kindred soul on the other side of a gap and makes a connection. This is not a "political" connection as the term is used, but a contact for further collaboration, for instance, a community person who will work *ex officio* with the department's programs and personnel, and who will serve as an unofficial liaison. More collaboration comes as time passes and more connections are made and used.

Many activities can be planned under the collaboration umbrella which could not be justified, sanctioned, or funded by the university. One such example comes to mind: an international Christmas carol songfest held in a city shopping mall. Any language can be involved, as can any educational level, from pre-school to college. Any segment of the city's population may be used to organize and prepare the songfest, and the expenditure can be as limited or expansive as the community purse allows. Generally, mall officials welcome such involvement, for all people are potential shoppers, and having large crowds in a mall is a cause dear to the mercantile heart. The program can be as simple as a printed collection of carols in different languages, or as complicated as an advertising booklet, where businesses have ads.

However, a word of warning: in its zeal to publicize the "we-care attitude of action," the department must not overlook the students which it serves on campus, its *raison d'être*. In fact, those infectious attitudes of action, collaboration, and outreach must first be felt by them, especially the majors and minors. Every day in the classroom or laboratory should be approached as a public relations opportunity. Faculty members must make a concerted effort to get to know them outside the classroom, for they too can help very much with public relations, and many times, very creatively and ingeniously. If the efforts are productive, students will realize that faculty are neither hard-core ogres nor monomaniacal creatures bent solely on self-aggrandizement. Indeed, if positive and humanistic, their experiences with faculty members could be the most positive public relations plan needed, for they will sense that we truly care.

From outreach strategies, we graduate to the sixth, and last, step: political strategies. It is incumbent on us to protect the environment which we have labored to develop. Essentially, this stage consists of gaining insight into the political arena, again on the different levels,. At this point we use the terms "connections" and "contacts" in a political sense. We may need to revitalize our acquaintance with legislators, university trustees and board members, city council members, education and budget committee chairs (campus, local, and state), and community movers and shakers.

Familiarity with Machiavelli's *The Prince* and with Martin Luther King Jr.'s *Why We Can't Wait* pays off during this campaign. Machiavelli discusses what to expect from rulers (by extension, administrators), and how to work with or around them. Barricelli, in his classic article (*ADFL Bulletin*, November 1980), explains how being a fox and a lion at the same time is not so far afield for a department chair. King's civil rights advice can be metamorphosed into a formula for how to act and work with people when they are adversarial.

It takes skill in communication and in human relations to succeed at this level of operations. Naive academics, in penetrating the "Good Ol' Boy Network," could get hurt, especially if they approach it innocently, expecting others to do unto them as they do to others. Another dictum which has been known to fail in this situation is the one about right and reason prevailing; often they do not. This is a different ball game, a very high-powered one, with high stakes and indifferent casualties. Here is also where we might choose to forego the advice offered to us by the campus PR experts, for theirs is the university's strategy, and ours might not be. We must become familiar with making and using connections and contacts; we must learn how and when to pull the strings that we cultivated, for timing can make or break an otherwise logical situation.

The attitude of action should extend to state language associations, which hold an important key to a successful working relationship among all levels and types of foreign language involvement because they include all locales and philosophies. However, just a little bit of *snobisme* can be deadly, for it could destroy the group spirit fomented by the organization. A strong lobbying affiliation can be successfully manifested without a great deal of individual fallout. Besides the safety inherent in numbers, there is also undeniable political clout. Everyone listens more carefully when an organization speaks for its collective and numerous members. It is imperative that we use our associations to help lobby or push the agenda.

And let us not forget another who should become politically involved—the state foreign language consultant. More and more, federal block grants are handled by state budget personnel, who inform consultants of their availability and of the conditions of funding. They are also more in charge of the execution of large proposal ideas. In addition, that person is probably the strongest link between colleges and universities and the State Department of Certification and the State Textbook Commission. The first dictates, sometimes irrevocably, *what* we teach; the second decides much about *how* we teach. The state consultant is the person whose job it is to keep these two bodies constantly aware of student needs. That person should become a pest on one hand. On the other, he/she should prick the collective conscience of governmental bodies as to what needs to be done. Then he/she should report to the state association at every opportunity, if only to let teachers know how better to reinforce their efforts.

The antithesis of the "We-care Attitude of Action" promulgated here is the old-style *snobisme* which is deadly for efforts at cooperation and collaboration within a department. It is the department chair's responsibility to see that the syndrome of "Killing off the one to save the other" is forever replaced by the "Save one, save all" syndrome. As soon as that message is received, everyone will benefit doubly from the renewed action of the department.

The evolution of the attitude of action into a we-care philosophy can hardly go wrong: faculty members are fully occupied with being relevant; departments chairs are fulfilled in watching their personnel reach full potential; state organizations have a pertinent agenda to follow, and membership is increasing; state consultants have the reward of productivity and renewed respect from their colleagues; students are thriving on the we-care diet. Everyone has become an activist and is involved in a visible response to the dictates of the nation's children in the foreign language classroom. Now, we are the way we *are*—no longer working in the subjunctive and conditional moods, but in the indicative and active moods. We are imbued with a definite, active, and regenerative professionalism, as well as a semblance of permanence and reality. Finally, we embody the essence of the "We-care Attitude of Action"—individually and collectively speaking out through many tongues, but with one voice!

CHAPTER 26

Elementary and Intermediate Foreign Language Programs: Nervous from the Service

Clifford J. Gallant
Formerly of Bowling Green State University

"In academe these are uncertain times. You know the signals: Budget cutback! Hiring freeze! Political correctness! And more. In such times, the person who's informed is the person who will survive—and even prosper." So began a full-page ad in a recent issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. They were seeking new subscribers and suggesting "The Chronicle" as a means of keeping up to date.

There are times when the bigger picture becomes focused in an issue of "The Chronicle," but for problems which make foreign language chairs and coordinators "nervous from the service" as they grapple with the nitty-gritty of the language department of the 1990s, a variety of additional resources and solutions is needed.

Despite retrenchment due to budget cuts for education at all levels in the 90s and beyond, the bread and butter of the foreign language department will continue to be the elementary and intermediate courses generally offered in multiple sections. The recruitment and retention of staff to teach these courses is but one of the problems. It may mean that in some semesters fewer sections will be authorized by an understanding dean not completely hung up with student credit hours so that upper-level course demands can be met. Even though staffing these courses with teaching assistants is a possibility, funds may not always be available for such a solution. This is the level where the numbers are and will remain. This is where the textbook market does its best job and reaps the profits as publishers are ever vigilant for the revolutionary and innovative text, either for the first year course alone or for the first and second years in an integrated approach. There are band-wagons to hop on and off where methodology runs its cycle and where the textbook industry is also ready to participate. Unless and until the secondary schools are able after four to five years to turn out students who have the proficiency to "comp out" or to continue at the third-year college or university level, the early years of language instruction at community college, college, and university levels will undoubtedly show high enrollments in the first-year courses with slightly fewer students in the intermediate courses across the board.

Every department has a service component: a series of courses which are accepted in both the major-minor program and which fulfill degree or program requirements in other areas. While meeting a need in the humanities area, they are also a source of prospective majors and minors in a foreign language. Whatever the motivation for completing two years of a language, students at this stage can and should come out with certain linguistic skills and knowledge of the culture of the world areas where the particular language is spoken. We rely on the textbooks we adopt to organize this information and help present it as we use our own resources.

The students who continue beyond the intermediate course should feel a sense of accomplishment in their ability to pursue further study at the 300 level, particularly in courses taught in the foreign language. Those who have satisfied the requirement at this point may stop with the same level of skills and knowledge. How are these skills and behaviors assessed? Departments clearly need a philosophy or a set of performance objectives other than a division of chapters in textbooks used throughout these four semesters as well as an agreement on their viability as students move from one course to the other. What should the student know and be able to do, for example, after completing the intermediate course? A program that is articulated and coordinated normally has built-in mechanisms for testing and assessing listening and speaking skills checked at given intervals by the oral interview technique, for instance, while the reading, writing, and cultural aspects are monitored in compositions and the other kinds of tests we regularly administer.

One problem found perennially in language departments is student placement. Most departments have a defined policy: to test or not to test. They also give advice after consultation concerning the level at which the student will function best, taking into consideration the time lapse since last contact with or study of the language. Some departments grant no credit for the 101 course if the student presents two years or more of high school study of a given language. Normally the student would begin at the intermediate level after two years of secondary school study. In some academic situations the first elementary course may be taken on a pass/fail option as part of the number of total pass/fails permitted in a given program. Frequently, this is a viable option since to begin at the second semester means starting at some midway point in the text unfamiliar to the student in terms of structures and vocabulary covered. And there are departments that permit students to start from scratch in a language already studied regardless of previous background. These *faux-débutants* can have negative influence in a class where most students are true beginners. Those students with four or five good years of language study in high schools are encouraged to begin somewhere at the 300 level if majoring or minoring is a possibility. Depending on skills, they may function well in composition/conversation classes, culture offerings taught in the language, phonetics, or introductory courses in literature.

In departments with graduate programs, teaching assistants become either an important asset or a liability. Using them to teach elementary or intermediate courses requires proper assignments along with pre-service or in-service training and supervision. Few have had a methods course. In some departments, a mentor is assigned to each TA, and the course may be team-taught in part or totally. Regular faculty who are approached to work with teaching assistants should be willing to take on this responsibility. They should, I think, be staff members who teach elementary and intermediate classes on a regular basis and be perceived by the chair and colleagues to be good teachers with a great deal to share. Unless given some orientation or a workshop before classes begin, TAs will teach as they were taught; this reality could be good or bad. Graduate students with study abroad experience or especially good language skills can be used to advantage at levels other than the elementary. With a sufficient number of sections taught by TAs, a coordinator can handle the orientation and supervision. Weekly meetings by language are beneficial in identifying problems in teaching and learning strategies and assessing both attitudes and progress. Some departments give one credit in "Teaching College Whatever" per semester for a maximum of two credits, generally not part of the graduate degree program.

One idea that I have found successful in working with teaching assistants is to assign all of them to a section of a language also being taught by the coordinator, preferably a 101. It is important to be certain to schedule the section taught by the coordinator at an hour when all TAs are free to attend his or her class for an arbitrary number of weeks to be set by the instructor. This demonstration class can be the best way to help individuals who have never taught before. They learn pacing, classroom management, techniques for group and pair activities, ways to present and drill material, to quiz and to test. They observe on a daily basis and with a purpose: they learn and attempt to apply what seems to work in the model class in their own classroom situation. With commonality of experience, the TAs have significant matters to discuss in their group meetings. After six to eight weeks of regular attendance, they may be set free and expect continued visits from the coordinator who will observe in turn the benefits reaped from daily classroom observation.

Articulating what we teach and testing the way we teach in the 1990s and beyond call attention to the teaching and learning process. If we are teaching for proficiency and communicative competence, testing by traditional means may require another look. The oral interview approach may be time-consuming, but used in conjunction with testing of the other skills and adapted by the competent teacher, it is an excellent way to assess performance. Students experience a sense of accomplishment in having to apply what is learned in the classroom and at home by being able to demonstrate active use of the foreign language in controlled situations.

In an effort to ensure that faculty members and teaching assistants alike cover the chapters and material agreed upon in each course and to hold to a given set of standards, some departments use the "common exam" or departmental exam at semester's end. There are advantages and disadvantages. Tests are prepared and approved in committee, often graded in committee, and grades assigned on a devised and approved scale. Some faculty feel the system infringes on their academic freedom, while others may find it a way to improve and maintain standards of excellence.

Students of languages need options when they can be provided. The second year course is often quite difficult, depending on the approach, for the student for whom language study is not easy. In some departments the needs of such students are met in various ways. At the intermediate level there are often separate tracks, different from the ones where the four skills may receive greater emphasis. A culture track is one of those. Here the class will work with authentic materials in the language and culture, but students may not be expected to speak or write a great deal in the target language. Another is the conversational track: one or two courses stressing the listening and speaking skills. A third area is language courses for special purposes: medicine, business, police work, etc. When at least one second track is in place at the intermediate level, the standard 201-202 course should consist largely of students who want to be there to improve communicative competence and proficiency.

An option that has proven popular in a number of institutions where staffing is not a problem is the intensive course, an offering where students may accelerate their learning of a language for a variety of reasons. The entire first-year course can be offered in one semester with increased contact hours as a start and with two instructors when possible. If successful, the second-year course may be offered in the same manner. One exciting possibility as experienced by this writer as director and teacher is the intensive course of one semester granting credit for the four semesters normally taken one by one. In this course the students are advised to take no other courses other than the language they are studying. The course requires at least three instructors for best results, staff who are able to work well together. Research has demonstrated that students tested after such an intensive course are more proficient in all skills as compared with those in the standard courses taken one semester at a time.

Language programs that have communicative competence as one of the goals also have a laboratory where students and instructor may meet as a class to hear other voices than that of the classroom teacher. Most current textbooks are sold with not only a workbook to accompany the text material, but also a lab manual, and more recently these are printed in a single volume. They provide opportunities for extra-class activities in listening comprehension and active use of grammar and vocabulary. When facilities and staff permit, students may also attend the lab on their own in a library system. The lab is as important and useful a learning situation as the individual instructor wishes to make it and the ancillary materials will permit. Students are likewise quick to learn what is important and useful from where the teacher places or fails to place emphasis and from how and what he/she tests. Again, the department chair and staff set the standards.

We have already discussed the role of the teaching assistant in the foreign language program. What about the regular full-time and part-time staff? Faculty should be permitted in many instances to teach at the levels where they feel they do their best work or are perceived to do their best: language, composition, culture, literature, etc. Community college systems seem to be able to attract and retain good teachers in their two-year programs where a good deal is also expected of them in quality teaching. Many instructors prefer first-year language classes and shun—even refuse to accept—the second-year sequence as part of their academic load, whereas others prefer the second-year course and accept elementary classes unwillingly. The intermediate level requires skills and abilities on the part of the teacher to get students to a common level before pursuing serious work. Student preparation and backgrounds differ, teaching standards and demands differ, and students' learning styles and expectations differ, and the time-lapse often occurring in previous instruction varies considerably. Each of these facets of the picture contributes to creating the challenge of the intermediate course.

"We Need Leaders Who Can Make Our Institutions Companies of Scholars, Not Corporations With Employees and Customers" is the title of an opinion piece by Jacques Barzun (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20 March 1992). In a letter to the editor, Barzun was taken to task for failing to address the insidious use of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities. The over-use of part-timers has become a common practice, enabling institutions to balance budgets or reduce deficits. While it is impossible to avoid the use of adjunct faculty and teaching assistants at institutions of higher learning in general and in community colleges in particular, care must be taken to use them judiciously. This is certainly one of the administrative challenges of higher education in the 1990s.

We must be candid, I think, in admitting that for the most part, elementary and intermediate language offerings—at least as presented in the vast majority of American institutions of higher education—are essentially skill-building courses which are not truly intellectually-oriented in the usual sense of the term. Within the entirety of the curriculum, they are not an *end*, but rather a *means* to an end, just as a course in freshman composition is not the intellectual summit of the English Department's collective genius.

Movements are extant—such as those found at the University of Minnesota and at other highly reputable colleges and universities—which deny academic credit for elementary courses except for the less commonly taught languages. While the merits of such plans could be debated at length with perhaps uncertain conclusions, we should surely adopt the position that as long as we are faced with the necessity/opportunity of teaching vast numbers of students who have little or no background in the target language, we must do the most creative, most thorough, and finest work of which we are capable in our skill-building courses. Need it be added that the student credit hours such classes provide for many of us are transformed into the "luxury" of teaching those occasional seminars on Galdós, Goethe, and Mallarmé to modest numbers of students?

The elementary and intermediate courses in foreign languages are our life blood in many practical ways. They deserve our continued best efforts toward improvement as an important multicultural contribution to the education of our young people.

CHAPTER 27

The Foreign Language Department and Interdisciplinary Studies

---

Sam L. Slick
University of Southern Mississippi

Several years ago I was invited to interview for an administrative position at a new campus being formed in the western U.S. The position was something akin to a Director of Arts and Sciences, a kind of semi-dean. In my preparation for the interview, I spoke often with key, senior staffers at that institution who guided me. They explained that the school was new and highly innovative, and that the "grand plan" called for a thorough integration of disciplines by means of interdisciplinary vehicles. My task was to convince the search committee of my credibility in the field of interdisciplinary studies and endeavors. So, I launched into a large ERIC literature search, confident that I would quickly uncover tons of books and articles related to interdisciplinary studies. Imagine my surprise when I discovered almost nothing of a global sense on the topic, and a very limited number of studies of specific programs undertaken at specific schools with specific departments. Most of these were narrative-like studies with anecdotal descriptions, unrigorous and certainly not objective, with virtually no reference to outcomes. I was amazed to discover, therefore, that the much talked about and much touted interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary programs, which we have all heard so much about, are some of the least studied topics and items in all of academia. This utter lack of research and sophistication with regard to such an important topic was well matched by the administrators at the university where I interviewed. To put it generously, they knew almost nothing about interdisciplinary studies. Although I didn't get the position, my initial work in researching questions related to interdisciplinary studies has stayed with me, and I continue to ponder those issues particularly with regard to foreign languages.

Let me introduce my subsequent observations by asserting two points.

First: Foreign language programs and departments are, by their very nature and composition, interdisciplinary. Such departments typically include francophiles, enthusiastic Latinos or would-be Latinos, and earnest students of German and Germany. They may include distant classicists, TESOL instructors, linguistics professors, and professors of LCTs. Even in more language-discrete departments such as those of Spanish and Portuguese, one finds literati (Peninsular and Latin American), pedagogues, and philologists. In large measure, these international and different constituencies, while all presumably addressing the same mega-agenda, are unique and separate entities, each with its own unique perspective and disposition. Thus, we have here an interesting irony: foreign language faculty, who by and large have had a lackluster record in the area of interdisciplinary studies, are curiously a faculty accustomed to living in close interdisciplinary-like quarters with colleagues whose fields they do not understand or share.

Second: Foreign languages represent the quintessential, fertile ground for forging interdisciplinary programs and linkages with other disciplines, because the study of language in the United States is both humanistic and practical. Thus we potentially can link with the traditional liberal arts as easily as with vocationally-oriented programs such as business and technology. For those foreign language departments that truly want to become full-service (and unfortunately many do not), the sub-stratum is somewhat in place for linkages with other liberal arts, since language study embraces not only language usage, but also literary studies and criticism, as well as culture (history, sociology, religion, music, art, political science, architecture, modern media). With regard to what are viewed as vocationally-oriented studies, however, foreign language departments have been slow to explore multidisciplinary relationships with disciplines *outside* the liberal arts. This insularity has been a mistake, because more often than not the future international movers and shakers on any given campus are the business, education, and sci-tech students, and *not* the liberal arts students. In a sense, we traditionally play to the wrong crowd, or at least we are missing a very obvious audience—those who will undoubtedly need language skills in their careers. But whether considering relationships with the liberal arts or non-liberal arts, the foreign language department, more than almost any other one, has chameleon-like abilities to meet and connect with other disciplines in a meaningful manner.

Let me now advance some ideas as to how to undertake interdisciplinary configurations and programs. In particular, I will address briefly the *What?*, *Why?*, *How?*, and *When?* of interdisciplinary programs.

WHAT? Interdisciplinary programs or multidisciplinary paradigms exist in a large variety of configurations. There are no rules nor covenants that govern them—other than, of course, imagination, logic, and what a particular institution is willing to support or accept. They may be formal or informal programs, entire degrees, diplomas, certificates, specialty courses, or team teaching. My own view is that we must define interdisciplinary programs in the broadest possible sense. When contrasted with single discipline approaches, interdisciplinary approaches are inclusive as opposed to exclusive. They are given to multiple views and interrelatedness instead of being insular and separate.

Perhaps the most basic form of interdisciplinary activity (and one which can provide a door to larger interdisciplinary programs) involves team-teaching and/or guesting. Since this sort of activity requires no extra monies, policy changes, or curriculum changes, it is the simplest way to begin interdisciplinary initiatives. Yet this paradigm is often overlooked. It may be as simple as inviting the local campus authority on French literature to lecture on, let's say, the impact of Balzac on 19th century French thinking and social policy, in an upper-division history course on 19th and 20th century France in the History Department. The converse might have a history professor lecturing in a 19th century French literature class on the historical context of the literature under investigation. As logical as this might sound, my experience is that far too little guesting or cross-lecturing occurs on most campuses. In fact, in most departments I suspect it never happens, and this says much about the insularity of single disciplinary studies.

Perhaps the next step up the calibration of interdisciplinary activities comes with the specialty courses. These courses often make language professors anxious, since they generally involve specialty-specific language as opposed to whole language courses. Examples of such offerings might include Spanish courses for criminal justice and nursing students who come to us not to engage in discussions of the subjunctive or Spanish castles, but rather how to arrest someone in Spanish or perhaps to explain to patients how to use a bedpan. Many other examples exist: French, German, and Italian specialty courses for voice majors, the only real objective being phonetic control; multilanguage courses for business students; German for sci-tech majors; Spanish for social workers; Latin for medical students, to name a few. These are interdisciplinary in at least two essential ways: 1) They invite a non-language clientele from other departments to come to our house to study language, and 2) They require language professors to address someone else's needs rather than their own.

Beyond the specialty course, and in addition to informal programs, we enter into a wide array of formal programs that provide attesting documents such as certificates and diplomas. Of course, there are also formal degree programs.

Certificates, for instance can be applied liberally in a variety of ways. Criminal justice majors, instead of simply minoring in Spanish, may seek, for employment sake, a certificate attesting to their proficiency in Spanish. There are, of course, many possibilities utilizing the certificate concept: communications majors who are certified to conduct basic interviews in other languages, business majors who are certified in a second language for business purposes, and many more. Such programs should bring together in discussion and cooperation foreign language faculty and faculty from other departments.

Perhaps the plan that we are most familiar with is Area Studies, a configuration that has been around for more or less thirty years. Some typical names for such programs are: Caribbean Studies, Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, and Slavic Studies. They are rich in possibilities. Unfortunately, all too often, because of our tendency to retract and retreat into our own little small worlds, each contributing department offers its course offerings solely and exclusively by itself unto itself. Example: the Russian professor teaches the Russian language component of the program and has little or nothing to do with the rest of the area studies program and faculty.

An interesting side note here deals with the relationship between foreign language departments and the school or college of education in pursuit of training primary and secondary school teachers. Interfacing is routinely required in the preparation of bilingual education majors, FLES teachers, and high school foreign language teachers. This relationship has the seed of a rich interdisciplinary mix. But yet the mix seldom develops. Rather, the language department provides the language training, and the school of eduction provides the pedagogy. Even worse, the two entities, the language department and the school of education, typically fail to communicate and cooperate with each other, because of a lack of mutual respect. I wish I had a dollar for every foreign language professor who has put down and verbally abused not only the local college of education, but the education faculty as well. In other words, the less we have to do with the education people the better. No need to get too interdisciplinary or interpersonal for that matter. But this niggardly attitude, which will have no place in higher education in the 21st century for those language departments who wish to survive, has it origins in humanism, and it is openly argued and fostered by humanists who by their training have been taught to be exclusive and live unto themselves. The result is that we routinely throw away or discount any interdisciplinary opportunities that might come our way through colleges of education: multicultural studies, for example.

Of course, there are many other approaches to interdisciplinary studies that often involve the foreign language department. In truth, I have space to reference only a few. Tremendous interdisciplinary opportunities exist in study abroad programs in which, for instance, geography, history, and foreign language professors all participate on-site in a foreign locale. Finally, foreign language departments must remember that, quite beyond the issue of providing instruction in foreign languages (presumably with functional proficiency) they also reside squarely in an English-speaking world, with English-speaking students and colleagues, sharing a curriculum with courses taught in English. Our contribution cannot stop solely with providing programs in and about the foreign languages taught in the department, but rather, since English is the vehicle in which most instruction occurs, and that with which most students learn, departments of foreign languages should actively seek out and teach courses in English: culture, history, and humanities. This expansion is liberating because quite often many of the best-traveled, best-read, and most creative faculty members of a college or university are in the department of foreign languages. But how do we share this experiential and intellectual wealth beyond the myopic confines of our little departmental world? Dare I utter the word? "English." It not only liberates the talents of our faculty brothers and sisters who *need* to teach other students, in English, but it also allows us to enter into relationships and alliances with many other disciplines.

The future holds great promise for foreign languages and interdisciplinary ventures in many areas and venues. Three that come to mind are: 1) Continuing Education (for instance, travel capsules—geo-politico-language faculty), because adult learners want integrated views, not single, fragmented perspectives that come so often from language departments. 2) Leadership studies—an up and coming discipline that should include language skills as indispensable to leadership, and 3) Cross-Cultural training—the new wave—which is fundamental to language studies.

WHY? There are many reasons for interdisciplinary studies. The cross-fertilization of ideas, contacts, viewpoints, dispositions, and so forth that is realized when different disciplines interact is in itself enough to compel us to engage in such studies. Moreover, interdisciplinary studies not only enrich foreign language studies and our discipline, but they *rescue* us from our own devices. Interdisciplinary relationships not only enhance our image and self-image, but they break down the thick and tall walls that foreign language departments often unwittingly construct around themselves. On many, if not most campuses, foreign language departments are viewed as marginal, odd, and insular. To seize the day and convert this reputation to another, we must establish alliances—many of them—with as many other programs as possible. In this way, we ensure our future. To protect us from future downsizings, rightsizings, and outsizings, we should publicly and privately seek new arrangements and ligatures with all sectors of the university community. Essentially I argue that foreign language departments must aggressively seek out new keys and connections in order to insulate themselves (not isolate themselves) from those who might see us as extra baggage or immaterial to the institution's mission. In short we must reach out to other disciplines of all kinds and engage them meaningfully so that virtually all units of the institution have a vested interest in *our* well-being, because *we*, the foreign language professors, are indispensable partners in their many enterprises.

This task is not easy. False barriers of individual disciplines—brought about by the myopia fostered by American graduate schools actively mitigate against a larger view of things. Indeed, graduate school trains and conditions people to think small. Very small. So small that graduate professors often see only their own limited world and are interested only in cloning themselves by preparing junior models of themselves, incarcerated in their own insularity. But this insularity often reaches new heights of the absurd in foreign language departments.

We have all seen it. It's bad enough that in so many cases foreign language departments don't "communicate" with other departments; there's yet more. Foreign language partisans and foreign language professors are always quick to point out the great value of international communication. Hence, we study foreign languages. But what do we say when we discover in so many departments that French professors won't speak with Spanish professors and German professors won't speak with either group? What's worse, they even put down or denigrate each other's culture and literature. I suggest that foreign language faculty not only talk with other segments of the university, but I also suggest that they talk with each other, not just social pleasantries in the hall but about their work and their field. In short, prior to liberating themselves from their own department in search of relationships with other disciplines, foreign language professors should practice talking with their own colleagues.

HOW? In my judgment, the foreign language department should begin to see itself not as an independent, well-defined, self-contained unit, but rather as an amorphous entity (a blob, if you will) ready and willing to match and mate with any and all academic sets and subsets, ready to assume and subsume others' educational agendas whether for humanistic or practical reasons. Foreign language leaders should be ready at all times to seize upon the latest development, trend, current, or disposition, and if judgment calls for it, make that development their own. Some recent salient examples show us how to do this. Four of the favorite buzz words currently in vogue have immense possibilities for foreign language departments; they are: global economy, cultural diversity, internationalizing the curriculum, and multiculturalism.

Now then, to my knowledge, none of these megatrends is the product of foreign language educators. But even though we were not the originators, we should appropriate these trends, provide leadership and direction, and make it clear to all in secondary and higher education that these are movements or trends supported and driven by foreign language folks, rather than settling for a "me, too." We should not sit around and be acted upon by either trends or administrators. But proposing and selling interdisciplinary initiatives and ideas are not easy tasks, and they should always be done within a context of the institution's mission and with a view to outcomes. We should avoid fuzzy-headed reasons for curriculum changes. Rather, we should generate objectives and articulate presumed outcomes of interdisciplinary programs.

WHEN? Today, right now. Begin planning and scheming. Expand your student base, which is your power base, not only by recruiting more majors and minors, but also, by roaming the campus in search of new "connections."

In conclusion, if the foreign language profession wants to flourish in the next century, it can, but there are right and wrong ways to proceed.

First, the wrong way: Retreat into our little foreign language and literature worlds and engage in self-babble about matters and issues that, although we might think them important contributions, are seen by others as utterly superfluous to the future.

The right way, to end on a happy note: Make friends and attach ourselves to as many kids on the block as we can, particularly the big kids on the block such as business and technology. These are our friends, not our enemies. In doing so, interdisciplinary studies will become a fundamental underpinning of our profession, and we will live a long and healthy life.

CHAPTER 28

Managing the Office: No, Secretaries Are *Not* God, Although They May Seem Like It

Richard W. Thames
University of Montevallo

After having served as chair of a foreign language department for many years, I am convinced that the successful management of the foreign language department office is, in large measure, dependent on having the right kind of departmental secretary. Indeed, for any number of reasons, a good secretary may well be the single most important person in any foreign language department. I hasten to add, however, that when referring here to a secretary as a "good secretary," I do not mean that this person is merely competent in conventional secretarial skills. Instead, I believe that the term "office manager" is a better and more accurate descriptor, considering the significant role that the departmental secretary plays in helping to assure the smooth day-to-day operation of the academic unit.

In this chapter I will discuss a wide range of issues related to the management of the foreign language office. In particular, I will consider such topics as: how to find a good secretary; what qualities to look for, given the international flavor and multi-language office environment; how to nurture an effective and efficient office staff; and office etiquette. Additionally, I will address the question of possible roles to be played by workers. And, finally, I will consider some effective techniques for utilizing the office as a promotional tool for the foreign language program.

Since most colleges and universities have a Personnel Office, that is usually the office to which one turns first before beginning a search for a departmental secretary. However, today, a growing number of institutions of higher learning also have an Equal Employment Opportunity office. And, if your institution does have an EEO office, that probably will be the office that you will be required to turn to, prior to recruiting any new personnel. In any case, all institutions of higher learning, public or private, that receive federal funds are required to adhere to guidelines established by the Office of Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action in Washington.

At some point, either before or after contacting the appropriate personnel recruitment office on your campus, you will have to develop an official job description. This description will eventually be reworked to accompany a contract for the position. So, let us first consider some of the qualities and skills that you may want your secretary to possess, and which you might want to include in your job description.

Here is an example of a description of duties for a foreign language department secretary:

> The position requires knowledge of general office procedures and the ability to handle faculty/student telephone communications effectively; prepare written communications including letters, memoranda, tests and examinations, papers and forms, as well as a departmental newsletter. Knowledge and understanding of university and departmental policies and procedures must be acquired. The knowledge or acquisition of computer skills is essential. Because of the nature of the position, it is highly desirable that the candidate have a knowledge of one or more of the languages taught by the department: French, German, Italian, Spanish, etc. In any case, the successful candidate must possess an outstanding command of English and be prepared to write and edit materials in that language. Other duties include supervision of student assistants, as well as management of the departmental office. Above all, the candidate for this position must be a person who possesses excellent people skills; one capable of dealing effectively with faculty, students, and others, in a warm and friendly manner. The successful candidate for this position must also be able to assume varied duties and responsibilities as required and needed, and be able and willing to solve problems when they arise. The person will be responsible to the chair of the department.

You probably will also want to include any additional contractual terms, such as: time frame (permanent, full- or part-time, nine or twelve months); and the work schedule, including the number of hours per week. Additionally, you will be expected to include in the announcement the qualifications (include education, experience, training, etc.) for the position. And, finally, you will want to make some sort of statement about the salary.

Again, let me stress the importance of selecting a secretary who possesses excellent people skills. It is not enough to have a secretary who is able to turn out a lot of work but who is not able to handle the sometimes excessive demands of the faculty and other pressures of the job. The kind of secretary you hope to employ is one who is able to assume and perform varied duties and responsibilities as required and needed, who is dependable and courteous, and who can take initiative and solve problems.

One of the additional and sometimes major problems a secretary may face in working in a foreign language department is the international flavor and multi-language office environment. This is not, however, an insurmountable problem, but it is one that requires patience and tolerance. Also, if you are able to find a secretary who has a working knowledge of one or more of the languages taught by the department, it may be helpful in this regard. But keep in mind that it is not easy to find and recruit multilingual secretaries, especially considering the type of salaries generally offered to such personnel in academic settings.

Having a multilingual secretary does not, in and of itself, assure that this person will be any better able to deal with the personal and cultural eccentricities of individual faculty members in the department. Then, too, even if the secretary is multilingual, it will be equally, if not more important for the person to have an excellent command of English and be able to translate or decipher letters, papers, documents, manuscripts, etc., into English. And, in some instances, especially where non-English speakers have attempted to write or to do their own translations, the secretary may have to do something which is tantamount to translating English into English. Therefore, the secretary often is called on to do a great deal of editing and/or rewriting, in order to make something linguistically workable and proper. Here, again, the secretary must deal with individuals who either expect too much of the secretary or, conversely, resent the secretary's efforts in correcting their written product.

As we are all well aware, some faculty members tend to be more demanding of the secretary's time than others. Therefore, it may be wise, or even necessary, for the secretary and the chair, perhaps in conjunction with the members of the department, to work together to set certain work parameters for the secretary. An example might be to require a minimum prescribed lead time to complete the typing and duplication of a paper or test or other materials. Such an understanding would eliminate some of the problems which arise when a professor asks for work to be done on a last minute basis, making it impossible for the secretary to comply with the request.

Likewise, for the effective management of the department, it is important that the chair work at developing and nurturing a positive relationship between himself or herself, the faculty, and the members of the office staff, including student workers. In this process, it is essential that open lines of communication between the various constituencies of the department be maintained and, where appropriate, that expectations and responsibilities be carefully stipulated. In the case of members of the office staff, the chair should encourage and support them whenever possible. The chair also should delegate to the staff of the department, particularly the secretary—or in the case of a large department, the head secretary—a considerable degree of discretion and responsibility for the management and operation of the office. Various responsibilities should be clearly divided and understood when there are multiple workers. Delegating responsibility to others does not diminish or alter the role of the chair as the chief administrator of the department; instead, it helps to give to those reporting to the chair a proper feeling of being needed and appreciated.

An effective secretary is also a person who has a clear understanding of proper office etiquette. Such a person should be capable of greeting faculty, students, and others in a warm and friendly manner. He or she should also be able to handle telephone communications in a friendly and efficient way, take and relay messages, and make referrals and provide information not requiring professional staff attention. Because the secretary frequently functions as a receptionist, he or she may be the one person in the department having the most frequent contact with the public. So, obviously, the chair will want to have a secretary who makes a positive and effective impression on those outside the department. And, although it may prove to be a potentially touchy subject, the chair will want a departmental secretary who wears appropriate attire in the office.

Student workers may also play a very important role in the day-to-day operations of an academic department. In fact, in many smaller institutions student workers may constitute the primary office support staff. Therefore, student workers frequently are called upon to perform many, if not most, of the duties and responsibilities that normally would be performed by a secretary. They are employed to be of service to the faculty and their fellow students and, for example, may be expected to keep the office and the language lab running smoothly. They, like any department employee, must be dependable, courteous, and be able to take initiative and solve problems. They also must be willing to perform duties as required and needed. In general, it is better to hire student workers who are actively involved in studying a foreign language, preferably majors or minors in languages, because such students are better prepared to do the kind of work they may be called upon to do and, thereby, their services are more valuable to the department's faculty members. Since student workers generally are under the direct supervision of the department secretary, it often will be the secretary's responsibility to inform student workers, at or before the time they begin work for the department, of their duties and responsibilities. These duties and responsibilities are worked out in consultation with the chair and faculty of the department, and in accordance with institutional rules. They, too, should be made aware that appropriate behavior and attire are expectations for their continued employment. This means, for example, that they be apprised that the office is not a place for visiting with friends nor for eating and socializing. Likewise, their phone calls should be very limited. When student workers are not directly engaged in the business of the department, they may be instructed to bring work to do or a book to read. Since they, like the department secretary, are frequently the person the public encounters first upon entering the foreign language office, they should be aware that friendliness and proper decorum are essential aspects of their service to the department. In general, however, most student workers understand and take seriously the importance of their contribution to the successful operation of the foreign language department.

Finally, let us consider some effective techniques for utilizing the office as a promotional tool for the foreign language program. As has been previously noted, having persons working in the office who are pleasant and courteous and who are able to greet the public and to assist them in whatever way they may, cannot help but make a very favorable impression on those they serve. These qualities, in turn, should translate into positive consequences for the department. Also, the office and the surrounding environment are potential areas for positively promoting the foreign language program in a number of ways. Certainly, having attractive and eye-catching bulletin boards promoting foreign language study or focusing on some feature of the department's program is one way. Having posters or pictures that show some area or aspect of life in one or more of the countries whose languages are taught in the department is a potential promotional tool. In this same vein, some type of posters or other visuals that show various language related career opportunities also may prove to be useful.

Some departments have been very successful in decorating the main area surrounding their offices and classrooms with appealing furnishings to give the department a more relaxed and comfortable atmosphere. Reading areas also might be set up, in which foreign language books and periodicals are available for students to read. Sometimes as a consequence of just looking at the pictures in a foreign language periodical or book, students become curious enough about what they see or the meaning of accompanying text that they may want to sign up for a foreign language course. Above all, it is essential that the department make a concerted effort to put forward a positive image. If the department wants to promote the study of foreign languages, it obviously must recruit students. And this effort can be greatly enhanced simply by creating a positive and friendly image in and around the foreign language department.

In conclusion, I have considered some of the things that go into making the management of a foreign language office a more successful enterprise. These include the considerable role that the secretary plays in the operation of the office and the foreign language department in general, the major contribution of student workers to the successful operation of the foreign language department, and various techniques for utilizing the office as a promotional tool for the foreign language program.

CHAPTER 29

Foreign Language Departments at Two-Year Schools: The Issues before Us

---

Anne O. Fountain
Peace College

What characterizes two-year colleges? A few are private, most are public; a very small number are women's colleges, while most are coeducational. Some are complex public service institutions; others focus on a strongly-held religious mission. Some are unionized and face the issues of strikes and collective bargaining; others offer a climate with little advocacy support for instructors. Some two-year institutions rely very heavily on part-time or adjunct faculty members; others depend on traditional tenure-track appointments. Salaries and workload show enormous disparity across the nation. Size is another important variable. Miami Dade Community College advertises an enrollment of over 65,000 credit students annually; St. Mary's College in Raleigh, North Carolina, is *sui generis*, combining the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, with a post-secondary enrollment of fewer than 250.

The traditions underlying these colleges are diverse as well. Publicly supported community colleges have typically sought to reteach an older student population and to provide vocational skills as well as first- and second-year college courses. Junior colleges traditionally devoted themselves to giving seventeen- to twenty-one-year-old students a liberal arts foundation which would allow for transfer to a baccalaureate institution. These factors are important because they illustrate some of the difficulties in addressing the role of the language department chair at a two-year school.

Nonetheless, the defining words "two-year" are crucial. In two-year colleges, be they community colleges (which have expanded their role over the last decade and a half) or junior colleges (which have declined rather dramatically in number), the focus is on the course work of the freshman and sophomore years. In language departments there is a heavy reliance on beginning- and intermediate-level classes or on courses in conversation or other practical applications. Teaching these courses is done by the professors in the department rather than by TAs, and most instructors have a fairly heavy teaching responsibility. Usually there is relatively little chance to teach upper-division courses.

Because two-year institutions of higher education are, in the main, non-residential, they tend to have a connection with the local community, or at least the surrounding counties. Perhaps directly related to this factor is the capacity for two-year colleges to identify immediately with the aims and concerns of articulation. The two-year schools often draw a commuter population or a residential population from the state or local region, and these student groups, in turn, generally transfer to nearby institutions. Two-year colleges are thus uniquely positioned to see the links connecting secondary school programs with basic college courses and, subsequently, courses in the major. Advising students for transfer implies looking at a range of college and university catalogs and knowing the sequence of courses at a variety of institutions. All of this can provide a very useful perspective.

Two-year colleges not only have a strong position in terms of articulation, but they also occupy an often overlooked and sometimes unappreciated role in higher education. The 1989 edition of *Profession*, published by MLA, includes a statistic which is rather dramatic: nearly 50% of all the foreign language programs in publicly-funded institutions are in two-year colleges.[1] Two-year colleges appear, thus, to be extremely important in providing the curricular foundation in foreign languages—a factor which should not be lost on either the department chair or the professors.

What, then, are the major concerns of a department head at a two-year college? What practical advice could be offered? The points which follow address areas of concern to two-year colleges as a whole, rather than to those of a specific size, status, or nature. With this observation in mind, three major areas appear to be of particular concern to chairpersons in two-year colleges: articulation, professional development for the faculty, and status in the profession.

The issue of articulation and its link to two-year institutions has been addressed by Fé Brittain, Chair of the Foreign Language Department at Pima Community College, Tucson, Arizona, and is covered succinctly in a Foreign Language Education Policy Statement issued by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. As Brittain persuasively argues, two-year institutions by their very nature constitute an important bridge between high school and four-year programs in higher education and should assume a leadership role in improving articulation among all levels of instruction. Department chairs should be key players in Academic Alliances and can promote participation in these alliances and other avenues for articulation by recognizing this work as a significant part of the faculty workload. Such a role will be more difficult at institutions where little regard is given to duties other than teaching. Nevertheless, the chair can support colleagues through personal affirmation and by suggesting successful models and sources of support such as the national office of Academic Alliances (Ellen S. Silber, Marymount College, Tarrytown, NY 10591-3796) and The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE, Washington DC 20202). Academic Alliances maintains a directory of the collaborative groups around the nation, publishes *Collaborare*, sponsors special seminars, and offers a clear voice for articulation in the profession. FIPSE increasingly recognizes the pivotal position of the first two years of college life and encourages a number of initiatives—for which funding is available—to enhance communication and collaboration between college professors and teachers in secondary schools.

Grants for articulation are available from other sources as well. Peace College, a private, two-year college for women, recently received a grant from the Southern Regional Education Board and is promoting cooperation and planning between colleges and the K-12 programs in foreign languages. Peace College hosts the Wake County Collaborative, one of the first three Academic Alliances in the nation, and works closely with the public schools in addressing articulation issues.

An additional consideration in regard to articulation is that of transfer to senior institutions. In some states, community colleges seem to be moving from a focus on adult learners, vocational training, and "short term offerings" to a younger clientele, arts and sciences courses, and a semester system. Such a move may be prompted by economics, since students often find it financially advantageous to earn credits at a two-year college, and subsequently to transfer to a four-year institution. The transfer question may also be bound up with larger questions of state spending on higher education, teaching vs. research, cost-effectiveness, and power brokerage in the state legislature. For all of these reasons, the astute department chair may need to be able to weather shifting political winds and should have a sound grasp of the policies and issues in higher education at the state level.

Another issue of importance for department chairs at two-year schools is professional development. Here the picture is both promising and disappointing. On the one hand, two-year schools have produced authors of excellent language texts, leaders of state, regional, and national organizations, and outstanding workshop presenters. Sometimes these accomplishments are achieved despite extremely heavy teaching schedules and minimal reward for professional attainment. The empathy for the needs of struggling students, the attention to basic courses, and the understood alliance with school teachers can work to the advantage of the two-year college language teacher. By virtue of sensing the pulse of the freshman and sophomore years of higher education, in almost every class, community and junior college professors find themselves at the heart of much of today's discussion about college learning.

And yet, it can indeed be challenging for the teacher in a two-year school to pursue an active professional life. Often funds are minimal or lacking; basic salaries, inadequate; the workload, daunting; and institutional enthusiasm, negligible. For many two-year college teachers the result may be a general apathy about participation in professional activities and the need for faculty development. Department chairs can assist both through example and encouragement. The chair can suggest involvement with professional organizations and conferences which are close at hand and not too costly, such as Academic Alliances, state-wide foreign language conferences, regional conferences of the Community College Humanities Association, and regional foreign language associations like the Southern Conference on Language Teaching. Department chairs at two-year colleges can also support a two-year college session or "strand" at local conferences and promote participation in the two-year college categories sponsored by most of the major professional organizations. An informal survey suggests that, at the national level, ACTFL, the AATs, and ADFL are among the most valuable professional associations for department heads at two-year institutions.

Finally, providing "renewal credit" or continuing education workshops for school teachers is an especially good way for those at two-year colleges to expand professional horizons and possibly to gain remuneration for the effort. Creating and teaching specialized topics for teachers fosters intellectual inquiry, brings depth to the discipline (that goes beyond basic courses), and can give the junior or community college scholar a sense of renewal. Professional development for teachers can take the form of weekend programs, summer sessions, or any other timeframe feasible for school teachers. K-12 teachers report a high degree of satisfaction with the sensitivity and rapport which often are a part of seminars sponsored by two-year institutions, and they express genuine appreciation for college professors who can impart knowledge at the same time that they demonstrate an understanding of "life in the trenches."

Closely related to faculty development, yet more expansive in scope, is the issue of professional standing for teachers in junior and community colleges. Here the dimensions can indeed be broad. Some two-year colleges possess endowed teaching chairs and may have a high profile both locally and nationally. Other institutions have a status which is modest at best. Perhaps most distressing for professors and department chairs at two-year colleges, however, are the misconceptions which colleagues from four-year colleges and universities have about their professional preparation. A typical assumption is that no one with really good academic credentials would teach at a two-year college. A related assumption is that there are virtually no Ph.D. holders at the two-year schools. Both assumptions are false. Ironically, the expansion of two-year colleges at a time when a large number of doctorates were awarded by universities has given many two-year schools (as well as other institutions) a good choice of candidates, especially when aspiring teachers had a strong interest in undergraduate teaching and wished to remain in a specific geographic area. Additionally, most two-year institutions do not face the problem of a professoriate laden with senior faculty members who received promotion when colleges were eager to award tenure. These dynamics, while not true at all institutions, have helped to provide strong faculties at many of the country's two-year colleges.

Recognition of the academic credentials and professional involvement of junior and community college professors has been slow in coming. Most members of the faculties of these institutions can recount instances of colleagues from senior colleges or universities who were surprised that they were involved with scholarship, publications, or leadership in a professional organization. Department chairs can help dispel some of these myths by highlighting faculty achievement through news sections in professional journals and through publicity in the local press.

Two-year colleges are an important and expanding component of American higher education and one that may be increasingly looked to for help in providing solutions to some of the problems facing higher education today: rising costs, under-prepared students, and enhanced competition for scarce economic resources. Chairs at these schools should be particularly aware of the major issues facing them today: the nature of their vital role in education, their importance in articulation, the many dimensions of faculty development, and the need to upgrade professional standing. It is through a deeper understanding of these issues that changes will be made, problems solved, and a brighter future assured.[2]

NOTES

[1] Bettina J. Huber, "Characteristics of College and University Foreign Language Programs," *Profession 89* (1989): 44.

[2] Acknowledgements are given to Toby Tamarkin, Jane Harper, and Fé Brittain for their comments and assistance with this topic.

CHAPTER 30

How Long to Stay on the Job: Counting the Gray Hairs

Richard B. Klein
University of Mississippi

> "If you can remember that collegial ingratitude is constantly lurking just under the surface, you should survive nicely, and even thrive in the right environment."
>
> —Friend of the writer as the latter assumed a departmental chair for the first time

How long should a chair continue to hold the reigns of a department? Indeed, how long should one continue in any position which requires more than an assembly line mentality and in which clashes of will, training, interpretation, and opinion are bound to occur with what sometimes seems to be a distressing frequency? Some of the principles which would be valid concerning the time spent as CEO of General Motors, President of the United States, or member of a local school board will apply. Others, however, will differ, primarily because of the highly restrictive, yet at the same time amazingly liberal and free nature of the intellectual mission which ideally binds together all members of the academy.

For some, the problem is a simple one; in fact there is no problem. They teach and administer in institutions where fixed terms are the rule.

Terms may be three years, five years, or occasionally more; there may be no possibility of succession, or there may be expected succession unless departmental colleagues have begun to organize a posse. There may be a system of rotating chairs, a situation which seems on the surface to be democratic and essentially favorable to all; yet, the underlying fact of rotation is *invariably* to centralize and aggrandize authority, power, and decision-making in the hands of the central administration. It is vital to know what the statutorial situation is before you agree to assume the post of chair; that way you can make your general plan for what you intend and need to accomplish with your eyes wide open.

I have developed what I consider a "normal" pattern of holding administrative reins in an academic situation. This pattern can be varied and adjusted to whatever your own situation might happen to be. I think that it really takes two years to learn a job—the logistics, paper-pushing, the institution, the personalities, and other such matters. This fact holds true even if you are not a newcomer to the department; many people will view you differently the day you become their boss and begin to exercise some degree of control or authority over their professional lives. Remember that you have to learn what people under your direction *can* do, what they *want* to do, and what they *will* do; many a chair has learned the hard way that what people can do is not necessarily what they will do.

During this initial two-year period, it is vital to have several short-range goals which can be implemented with relative ease and a minimum of discord, but which have the effect of letting people know that you are there, that you are actively working, and that you are a force with which to be reckoned. Ideally, these goals do not have to be the product of committee work or group decision-making; they can come directly out of your own fecund mentality. This period of time will—and should—tax your creative and managerial instincts.

During these first two years it is essential that you begin work on several long-range goals which can be put into effect during the next three years. This second period of time is probably the hardest—you have to achieve group consensus, you must give your colleagues a genuine feeling that they are just as important in the process as you are, and you must keep an often disparate group in line, talking with each other, and favorably disposed toward your leadership.

With a bit of luck, at the end of the three-year period, you will have two years or so to "coast." This is not to say that you will engage in a period of professional indolence where you will do nothing, but it is a realistic appraisal of what I believe is a typical and quite legitimate pattern of administrative success. During this time you also have one or two years to consolidate your gains, to determine if you really want to continue being an administrator, or perhaps to get ready to move on to the next post. A number of happenings can take place to disrupt or alter this "schedule" to a degree, but I believe it to be essentially accurate and not subject to major revision. Thus, it seems to me that eight or nine years is the maximum time that anyone other than a superman or superwoman can maintain a viable creative drive, put up with the inevitable foibles and occasionally unattractive qualities of faculty and administrative colleagues, and continue to keep current in the academic field while at the same time retaining some personal dignity.

Although many neophytes do not realize it—and many would not want to admit it if they were to do so—a chair's post should be both taxing and intellectually demanding, but it should also be *stimulating, of both professional and personal value*, and perhaps above all *enjoyable*. A chair's post, fortunately, is not like living with your children; little Sally or Bobby (sometimes *big* Sally or Bobby) simply cannot be sent back where they came from just because they have ceased to be pleasurable in the short (or long) run. No one, however, should consider himself or herself bound to continue in a chair's post if all enjoyment and sense of professional accomplishment have come to a halt. Don't hold the post a day longer than the time when you know you should quit. There are many valid areas of service in the academy; administration is only one of them. Be true to yourself, to your intellect, and to your moral convictions. Interpret your status with a modicum of grace, a bit of humility, and a healthy measure of common sense.

Chairs differ greatly in their ability to determine when they should step aside. Some read signs exceedingly well, others less so. First, look within yourself; if you feel it is time to leave, it probably is. Externally, however, there are a number of signs which, when read correctly, indicate clearly that the time has come to move on to something else—even though this next step will vary a great deal according to the interests, talents, and personal and professional needs of the individual chair.

Watch for the following possible situations. **It is time to leave when . . .**

1) The central administration is obviously unwilling to allocate resources within its power to your unit. This reluctance frequently indicates that the dean and you have markedly differing perceptions of what needs to be done for the professional development of your department. Be certain, of course, that the dean or VPAA is really being niggardly with you, not that there simply are no resources available. If you and your dean are at an impasse about what you *know* has to be done to enhance your department and he/she refuses to help you, think carefully. If communication between you and the dean has simply broken down, one of you should step aside. Hint: it's seldom going to be the dean.

2) You have successfully met the goals you set for yourself at the beginning of your term. There is nothing wrong with "coasting" for a year or two, but you are doing no one (including yourself) a favor if you do not have your intellectual, managerial, and creative forces in high gear in a meaningful, ongoing manner.

3) You have become bored with the job. When you dread facing colleagues and their problems simply because you have seen it all before and you know they won't shape up anyway! When the golf course or your rock garden beckons with markedly more allure than vital aspects of your job on a repeated basis.

4) You have gotten bogged down with petty responsibilities, personalities, and routine, leaving less and less time for the creative aspects of your job. It must be clearly remembered that routine, paper pushing, and personality clashes are integral aspects of any chair's post; the key words are "LESS AND LESS TIME" for creative work.

5) You have begun to feel that you are no longer doing a good job. The reasons may be many, varied, or unknown, but *get out.* You do no one a favor, not yourself, your family, or your colleagues by retaining a post for which you have no enthusiasm or sense of accomplishment. Never let the thought that there is no one to replace you hold you back; there may well be no one as good as you, but give them the opportunity you once had. Is not a spirit of generosity one of the most vital aspects of a good administrator?

6) You feel that you have neglected your scholarship responsibilities for too long and that you must get back to your chief intellectual interests. This problem is not as acute in foreign languages as in some fields, but it is a problem nonetheless. The exception to this situation comes when your duties or interests are such that you consider yourself a professional administrator, not a professor of language, literature, or linguistics. I have no quarrel with those who place themselves into that category, although such a view will inevitably alter one's perception of any administrative post. In many ways and in many institutions, it does define accurately the true administrative condition.

7) You feel that you have begun to ignore professional development opportunities for some of your staff members because "I've already suggested that eight times before and he/she still won't do it." Colleagues, particularly those who seem a bit worn out, have a legitimate right to expect your creative interest and concern about their professionalism and standing in the field.

8) You feel that you need a sabbatical and your administration has a[n unwise] policy of not granting sabbaticals to administrators. While such a policy may sound obtuse and incredible, it is a fact of administrative life in some institutions. If you need a sabbatical, if you have a valid project, and if you have anything resembling a strong desire to make progress on an intellectual task for which you won't have time if you remain as chair, *resign*. And don't look back.

9) When you know that further progress in your department can be made only by new hiring, and projected retirements or resignations make this highly unlikely for five or more years. Only masochists enjoy beating their heads against an office wall. This, too, is something you should consider seriously *before* you accept a chair's position in the first place. It is a fact, however, that we usually don't think about this vital aspect of the job, particularly if we accept a chair's post in a different institution.

10) You have determined that internal or external problems within your unit have come to the point of consuming your personal, non-academic life. Your family usually stays with you until the end; faculty colleagues tend to wither, fade, and occasionally depart. Never let your family be disrupted by your

work; if you do, be prepared to pay a higher price than you perhaps want.

11) You have received a professional opportunity—administrative or otherwise—which you just can't turn down. Beware of refusing a good opportunity simply to finish a task where you are or because your colleagues are such lovely and professionally astute individuals. There are both vital tasks and colleagues of quality in every institution.

12) You have developed the feeling that your unit cannot survive (or thrive) without *you*. Think about this: Has your department or institution collapsed or even seriously missed a beat because anyone you can think of left its employ during the prior decade? The thought is a humbling one. The world was not designed to be dependent on any one individual, no matter how capable, how intelligent, or how facile.

Chairing an academic unit is a complex task—at times not unlike trying to herd cats—encompassing service (frequently above self), your own professional development, and a keen awareness of the legitimate needs of others on many levels—family, colleagues, students, and your entire institution in the larger sense. You have to keep these "constituencies" in mind at all times.

While any true profession must of necessity involve an active thought process, one which on a daily basis touches the lives of so many individuals is particularly worthy of constant reflection and self-examination. Keep this examination and thought dynamic and ongoing, and don't be afraid to leave when you know the time is right. Teaching languages and administering language departments are truly noble callings, but individuals of true calling and deep-seated "nobility" know when to leave with grace, dignity, and a sense of fulfillment.

It is frequently helpful to remember the situation in which you left your previous post; whether it was managerial in nature is not especially important. If you left with relatively good feeling toward the institution, your co-workers, and your superior, your instinct for knowing when to leave is probably operating at the right level. If your departure was marked by feelings of bitterness, regret, remorse, or the general rejoicing of your colleagues—not for your new opportunity but rather because they thought you had overstayed your time—resolve to profit from that experience. I have learned a great deal from my previous employment experiences, and I urge you to consider your former status with an eye to improving yourself as a human being and as a professional. Indeed, the aforementioned grace, dignity, and sense of professional fulfillment should be the real goals when one decides to take leave.

CHAPTER 31

Additional Items of Importance: What you Really Need to Know, but Didn't Know Enough to Ask

Richard B. Klein
University of Mississippi

Sam L. Slick
University of Southern Mississippi

Each chair is faced—sometimes on a daily basis—with various problems which do not necessarily constitute major impediments or difficulties with his or her work, but which nevertheless drain time, energy, and emotional well-being from the efficiency needed for the tasks at hand. The editors wish to comment briefly on some of these items. You are invited to write to them about similar pertinent topics which might profitably be added to subsequent editions of this book.

AREA STUDIES, WOMEN'S STUDIES, FILM COURSES, CREATIVE WRITING, COMPARATIVE LITERATURE, AND SIMILAR NON-TRADITIONAL ACADEMIC AREAS

Unless you received your terminal degree after 1980 or so, you are probably the product of a traditionally-oriented literature or linguistics program, whether or not you know it. There is absolutely nothing nefarious about a professor who believes down deep that Medieval Spain (or nineteenth-century France, or the Wiemar Republic) really is the apex of human civilization as long as that questionable judgment does not preclude honest consideration and evaluation of other newer fields that most contemporary academics consider areas of valid academic and intellectual interest.

My own experience has been that neither I nor most older colleagues (all much older than I!) have a lack of good will concerning these fields, but that it is difficult to judge them fairly because increasing specialization in languages has made expertise more and more difficult to acquire. Within the confines of your faculty statutes, it is recommended that you go to outside experts who can provide the expertise you need in evaluating such scholarship—competence which should let tenure or promotion committees arrive at a point where they can judge fairly matters such as classroom teaching, service to the institution and department, and perhaps stickier matters. such as collegiality and departmental citizenship. **RBK**

ARE YOU WILLING TO PAY THE COST OF CHAIRING?

There are many costs involved in chairing a department of languages (or any other department, for that matter). Unfortunately, not all of them are financial. Your institution should be willing to compensate you for the possible grief, time, and trouble involved. Financial arrangements vary considerably from one institution to another. Some schools give only an administrative supplement which is lost when one relinquishes the post. Other schools make this a permanent part of one's future salary. Be completely clear before you accept a chair's post just what the financial situation is and what it is likely to be when you move on or up to another area of professional service. It is also vital that you have a clear understanding of what your teaching load is and to what extent you will be expected to engage in scholarship during your term.

Other, non-financial costs are harder to assess and to live with at times. You will have colleagues who are convinced that there is no real effort involved in your post and that a veritable pecuniary bonanza accrues in geometric progression in your bank account. Take comfort in knowing that such opinions are usually not held by the more thoughtful elements in a department. You will have to accept that you are no longer privy to everything that goes on in the department; you will also find that you do not become privy to very much of what goes on in the higher administration. You are middle management, with considerable responsibility and rather scant authority. You must maintain yourself in good communication with individuals whom you may not particularly like, and you have to be content with living on the social periphery of the department.

Perhaps the most difficult matter to cope with is simple collegial ingratitude. It is a natural and very human reaction for colleagues to ask themselves "what have you (the chair) done for me **lately**?" Chairing a department can make one lose a naive faith in the goodness of human nature, although it does have other rewards. After all, chairing is supposed to be an area of valid professional service, not an experience in total felicity. If you understand this principle when you begin your term of service, your eyes will be wide open, and you will not be so likely to be surprised by any turn of events. **RBK**

ASSOCIATIONS FOR LANGUAGE PROFESSIONALS

It does not seem unreasonable to expect each teacher in your department—certainly those employed full-time—to belong to your local and state language associations. Have the departmental secretary prepare a list of these groups early each fall and distribute it to everyone, including teaching assistants. Some of these groups have student rates which are very low and which are designed to entice people into early membership. You should add the names of the various AATs for the languages represented in your department, and those of a few other groups. The list which follows is intended to be a starting point; a completely inclusive one is impossible. *PMLA* complies a "Directory of Useful Addresses" for its directory issue published each September.

American Association of Teachers of Arabic
Prof. Dilworth Parkinson
280 HRCB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602

American Association of Teachers of French
Prof. Fred M. Jenkins
57 East Armory Street
Champaign, IL 61820

American Association of Teachers of German
Dr. Helene Zimmer-Loew
Suite 104
112 Haddontowne Court
Cherry Hill, NJ 08034

American Association of Teachers of Italian
Prof. Pier Raimondo Baldini
Dept. of Foreign Languages
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages
Prof. George Gutsche
Dept. of Russian and Slavic Languages
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
Prof. Lynn A. Sandstedt
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, CO 80639

American Classical League
Prof. Harry C. Rutledge
Dept. of Classics
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

American Council of Teachers of Russian
Prof. Dan Davidson
1776 Massachusetts Avenue
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Mr. C. Edward Scebold
6 Executive Plaza
Yonkers, NY 10701

American Philological Association
Prof. William J. Ziobro
Dept. of Classics
Holy Cross College
Worcester, MA 01610

Association of Departments of Foreign Languages
Dr. Elizabeth Welles
10 Astor Place
New York, NY 10003-6981

Association of Teachers of Japanese
Japanese Program
Middlebury College
Middlebury, VT 05753

Chinese Language Teachers Association
Prof. Chih-ping Chou
East Asian Studies Dept.
211 Jones Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

Modern Language Association
Dr. Phyllis P. Franklin
10 Astor Place
New York, NY 10003-6981

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
Ms. Susan Bayley
Suite 300
1600 Cameron Street
Alexandria, VA 22314 **RBK**

COOPERATIVE VENTURES

It is regrettable that language professors not infrequently do not mix well with other people on the faculty. They tend to guard with unmerited jealously their own specific language, their own courses, and what they perceive as their own interests. Such an attitude invariably puts us in an undesirable position when we seek votes to institute a curriculum, to establish a more reasonable number of hours for our elementary and intermediate sequences, and the like.

Take every possible opportunity to encourage professors to participate actively in such ventures as Faculty Senate, various college or university committees, athletic boards, advisory boards to campus religious foundations, cultural events, athletic events, and civic ventures. This is an excellent way to meet people, to establish friendships, and to extend what should be a breadth of vision into the institution as a whole. It can happen that your teachers will be exposed for the first time to life beyond nouns and verbs, and some of them may respond with a burst of enthusiasm and energy which will amaze you. After all, carrying one's fair share of the load should be considered the norm in an academic community. **RBK**

CULTURAL ADDENDA

Get your department into the habit of sponsoring cultural activities for your students—and gently insist that faculty members participate too. Some examples are language-specific clubs, movie series, concerts, exhibits, and lecture series. Financing can be a problem, although I have found that deans are surprisingly willing (and able) to expend funds for such activities even though they might be more parsimonious with monies for other purposes. My own institution has a handsome and decently endowed lecture series which was established 30 years ago and which has brought prominent modern language scholars to an isolated rural campus, making a definite intellectual difference within and without the department. You might have to get involved in fund raising if you want to acquire an endowment for a specific purpose, but it may be easier than you think.

Be certain to assign primary responsibility for such activities to another faculty member, although you should be both very close and supportive behind the scenes. Too, it must be added that **you** also have to participate in these activities; with students it is not, after all, a matter of "us" and "them." If our discipline is important to us, we will **want** to participate; if not, perhaps we should question the depth of our intellectual commitment. **RBK**

DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE ISSUES WITH PART-TIME, ADJUNCT, AND VISITING PROFESSORS

It is always vital that you adhere scrupulously to your institution's faculty statutes regarding basic matters of governance like voting rights for adjunct, part-time, and visiting professors. While it should be assumed that such people are fully qualified professionals—**never be talked into hiring anyone you consider unqualified**—and that they are invited to all normal departmental meetings, you should state clearly at the beginning of each meeting your school's policy about voting; only a rare institution would forbid participation in discussion. If part-time and visiting people are able to vote, encourage them to do so. If the statutes prohibit them from voting, encourage them to participate in discussion. It is frequently the case that they have a different perspective and that they thus view problems with an outlook different from your own and from that of the regular faculty; this is particularly true in the case of visiting faculty who may have wide experience at another institution.

From a purely personal standpoint, it is in everyone's interest to assure full professional participation by all in the department. Rare is the problem which cannot be moved a bit closer to solution by wider participation. There are occasional issues which tend to affect part-time people more than others; for instance, should the department try to combine several part-time positions into one or more full-time lines on the departmental budget? At times, common sense indicates that such matters be discussed in an executive session or in a special meeting with full-time people only.

Part-time people are often poorly paid, given less than choice assignments, and may not be recognized for the significant dimensions they can and do bring to a department. If you can't get vast sums of money or benefits for them, at least let them know that they are valid professionals and that you value their ideas, participation, and contributions to the department's collective effort. **RBK**

DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS AND COMMITTEES

Departmental meetings can occasionally become the unit's battleground. Some individuals have the unattractive tendency to bring out their hidden agendas, their low-grade ammunition, and some of their least attractive qualities at these affairs, principally since a departmental forum usually ensures at least a polite hearing for even the most outrageous ideas. Nevertheless, open departmental meetings are one of the reasonable prices we pay for living in a democracy.

If your faculty statutes mandate meetings on a regular rotation, be certain to observe the requirement. If the matter is left unfixed or unrequired, I suggest that you set a specific time for a meeting each month on the same day and at the same hour. I once had the habit of commencing each semester with a meeting, not scheduling any others except because of administrative necessity or upon request of a professor. Although I was willing to have a meeting under these conditions, there were very few requests; frankly, most people just don't want to be bothered. Having a meeting on a regular basis is preferable since it gives everyone the opportunity to bring up matters on his or her mind. I suggest that you try to limit meetings to an hour, that you always start with an agenda which is distributed in advance, and that you announce clearly who is eligible to vote.

Work through committees as much as possible since most problems coming your way have solutions which can be expedited more readily by smaller groups which can then report to the departmental meetings for fuller discussion. Your statutes may mandate certain committees, or you may have a series of *ad hoc* committees established to work on a particular issue. It is certainly preferable to let individuals be *elected* to major committees, although you may simply want to ask for volunteers for groups you deem of lesser significance. Committees should always have an odd number of members, and you should be careful of such matters as racial, ethnic, and gender balancing. Always avoid loading a committee with people you know have prior and unchangeable points of view regarding a specific topic. There are individuals, after all, who are completely impervious to evidence and who have long histories of demonstrated intransigence; strive to avoid such people, at least when you appoint committees. **RBK**

DUE PROCESS

Due process is guaranteed under the Fourteenth Amendment and is a very serious charge for all university administrators. Regardless of personal or personnel disputes and problems, the chairperson, for reasons of self-protection and ethics, should always be mindful of substantive and procedural due process. A review of court cases involving post-secondary institutions clearly reveals that administrators and schools that do not clearly define the means to ensure due process often suffer litigious consequences. Make sure that faculty members have recourse to hearings and appeals to decisions that may affect them adversely. Another good rule of thumb is to make certain that each faculty member in your employ receives the same even-handed treatment. In short, be fair, treat all equally and, above all, be CONSISTENT. Avoid all arbitrary or capricious actions against anyone. Since "due process" is a complicated and sophisticated legal principle with many ramifications, you should consult with your institution's legal counsel if in doubt.

But due process is something guaranteed to chairpersons as well. Persons assuming the role of chair should insist upon due process for themselves and know how and when to demand it. **SLS**

EASING A COLLEAGUE INTO RETIREMENT

One of the most difficult and painful tasks a chair ever has is to ease someone who has been an esteemed colleague into retirement when the person has largely ceased to be a viable member of the professoriate. Until recent years this problem did not even exist, since retirement was normally mandatory at 65, sometimes with a few years of part-time teaching added on at the end to ease the professional and financial transitions to a new stage of life experience. Tenured professors who have not reached the age of 70 by 1 January 1994 can theoretically stay in the classroom until they drop. While there are limitations concerning health and viability, they are of necessity so general that most professors who continue to breathe can retain their posts as long as they are not on a life support system.

In actual practice, this problem is not as common as most people would surmise. Really capable, creative people frequently want to develop new areas of interest, have non-academic projects they want to complete while they still retain health and vigor, or are simply tired of the routine of academe after four-plus decades. There are a few individuals, however, who have never developed outside interests, who truly believe that the most compelling aspects of life cease when classroom contact ends, or who have an ill spouse (and thereby need additional funds, etc.). It is not to be implied that these professors are always the deadest wood on the departmental tree. Some excellent professionals simply cannot face impending retirement and the life changes it inevitably brings, to say nothing of the fact that it symbolizes the beginning of the last major stage of one's life span.

Theoretically, one should talk directly with the person in question. I must candidly admit that I have never been able to do this except in distressingly circuitous ways. I suggest that you talk with your dean or with a campus personnel officer to determine if there are any incentive retirement packages available. If this is the case, give all of this information to every professor 50 or over. Also speak with the dean about what has been done in other departments and ask what he or she can suggest. If it is possible at your school, a phased retirement program with a year of 2/3-time teaching, followed by a year of 1/3-time work, and finally a year where the individual teaches one course for one semester of the entire year is often a favorable plan for everyone concerned.

If the professor continues to do a decent job, the problem is not serious, but if performance has been flagging markedly, 'much greater difficulties await you. **It is virtually impossible to prove incompetence**; don't even try. Do be a concerned friend and colleague of the person; let him or her know that you have the best interest of all concerned at heart. Occasionally, an individual is just waiting for a hint that it is time to move on. In the cases of obdurate people who refuse to accept reality, virtually nothing can be done. Never try to punish the individual by insisting on a ridiculous schedule, an excessive work load, or a degrading assignment. While there are no easy answers to this problem, always keep in mind the deeply human dimension, and remember that the approach of a new stage of life is never easy for anyone. **RBK**

ENTERTAINING

One of the responsibilities which being a departmental chair inevitably involves is that of entertaining colleagues, interviewees for faculty positions, visiting dignitaries, and perhaps potential donors to your institution. **There is no question that the entirety of the financial outlay for this activity should be borne by the institution**. Regrettably, it is also common to find that only a fraction or occasionally none of these expenses will be paid by your departmental budget, the dean's account, the Alumni Association, or some other budgetary unit on your campus.

If there is some sort of "state occasion" on which you are expected to entertain, accept the responsibility with grace and aplomb. If you are expected to pay for this yourself, try to do things with minimal expense. If you are partially reimbursed, you can do a bit more; if you are fully reimbursed—a situation which seems to hold on fewer and fewer campuses—do things as you really believe they should be done. It would seem that the spirit of generosity referred to previously in this book would preclude neither the use of one's house or apartment nor a willing spirit. **Out-of-pocket financial outlay for alcohol, food, and decorations should always be the responsibility of the institution**.

Unless you have a mate who is on a greased track for sainthood or the Nobel Peace Prize, be prepared for occasional spousal resentment. After all, what does he or she get out of it except a disheveled house and a dishwasher full of dirty plates? Never place the burden of preparation on your spouse; do your own share (and more), perhaps soliciting the aid of a reliable person or two in the department. Some people are very willing to help, and it gives them some idea that your job is not without effort and incidental frustration. While it may seem churlish to say so, there are times when you will entertain people in your home whom you don't especially care for, or whom you would never entertain under circumstances unrelated to your profession; think of this as an unrequited contribution to the profession and to the advancement of languages.

While occasionally other professors in the department can be expected to help with "official" entertaining (as in the case of your Professor of Tagalog with a Visiting Professor of Tagalog), they really are not paid for those functions and you are, however poorly. Facile, **seemingly** effortless entertaining is a gift, usually not one that can be acquired. If you have the gift, enjoy it and don't be resentful of a **moderate** amount of out of pocket costs. One of the small things I learned to treasure as a chair is the comments received from innumerable guest lecturers and candidates for faculty jobs who took the time to express their thanks for being entertained in my home. **RBK**

ESL/TESOL

TESOL is probably the fastest growing "new discipline" in higher education. But TESOL programs are primarily graduate programs and they often are not large enough to constitute a departmental unit. A perfect place to house such offerings is the Department of Foreign Languages. This is true because the overall objective of TESOL professors is to teach a foreign language—in particular, ENGLISH!! Moreover, a large percentage of research in second language acquisition comes from TESOL. Of course; adding TESOL to a foreign language department significantly strengthens your political base within your institution.

If there is already a TESOL program at your institution but it is not in your department, you might explore the possibility of realignment. A palace coup may be in order. In any event, make a point of knowing and working with the TESOL people. They can be valuable partners in research and politics. They are dedicated to language for communication and are our natural academic friends. If there is no program at your school, explore the possibility of starting one in your department. **SLS**

EXPANDING THE CURRICULAR BASE WITH LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES IN A COLLEGE OR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION

A problem found in some departments in colleges and two-year institutions is a basic paucity of curricular offerings which are tempting to potential students, a situation which usually does not exist to the same extent at a large, comprehensive university. While you need to make certain that you have a firm base for majors in your principal departmental languages, you should always be on the lookout for ways to institute **ongoing** instruction in less commonly taught languages. (It is usually not helpful to get a commitment to institute a course in Swahili or Urdu for one year only.) A minimal three- or four-year commitment is what you should seek, although if a language offering fails because of a lack of student interest or some other reason, it is no disgrace to say so. Be prepared to do with one fewer section of Spanish if you want to institute Portuguese, with one fewer of French if you want to introduce Italian, with one fewer section of German if you need to bring Russian to your curriculum.

Do not fear a small short-term loss when there is potential for a significant long-term gain. Besides, several years after beginning a successful program in an LCT, the dean may even forget that you took the course from already existing allocations and may be inclined to restore the original amount. Avoid ranking languages in terms of your personal perception of their cultural or linguistic worth; be even-handed, supportive, and creative. At times a bit of sleuthing can result in foundation or other support for a new language. I was able to commence Japanese instruction in my department with the help of a grant from the Hokkaido Foundation—through a proposal which was developed by a part-time French teacher more or less on her own. Certainly you must resist the temptation to be guided solely by student credit hours in the short-range, and you must resist with equal strength the facile lure of boosting teaching loads in order to start a new language. LCTs are fragile flowers in the American curriculum; they need to have a demand created, to be nurtured, and to be given special attention which can exceed what immediate returns might merit. The cause of less commonly taught languages is a righteous one, and the long-term gain to the entire field can be enormous. **RBK**

GETTING STUDENTS TO HELP IN PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS

It is frequently the case that your undergraduate students are some of the most enthusiastic promoters of language study. To the extent possible, let the students themselves organize, plan, and be responsible for activities such as language clubs, tutoring efforts for deficient students, and off-campus cultural activities. It is fine to plant an idea or two in the mind of more astute or enthusiastic students, but except in very large universities, these activities will be more successful if they are student-initiated, student-directed, and student-oriented. You must always encourage faculty to participate in a non-directive, but supportive manner. Students are quick to sense when their prerogatives are being "taken over," and they will not respond favorably. If you are fortunate enough to have a number of older (or other) non-traditional students in your classes, you will find that they frequently are big boosters of language study and that they can be encouraged to turn their years of life experience into attitudes supportive of languages. **RBK**

HONOR SOCIETIES

All language chairs certainly want to do anything which will recognize students who do superior work in their departments. While there are many ways to recognize high achievement in languages on the post-secondary level, one of the best—and at the same time easiest—ways to do this is to make certain that active chapters of various honor societies are established on and for your campus. Generally, these groups do not involve "activities" as such; most have only one or two initiations a year, although a few chapters may have monthly or bi-monthly meetings. While this is not a complete listing of college-level honor societies for languages, the following groups should be of interest:

Delta Phi Alpha (German)
Prof. Richard K. Seymour
Dept. of European Lang. & Lit.
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dobro Slovo (Slavic Languages)
Prof. Sanford Couch
Dept. of Foreign Languages
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Eta Sigma Phi (Classical Lang.)
Prof. Brent Froberg
Dept. of Classics
Box 171
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, SD 57069

Gamma Kappa Alpha (Italian)
Prof. Maria Rosaria Vitti-Alexander
Dept. of Foreign Languages & Lit.
Nazareth College of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14618-3790

Phi Lambda Beta (Portuguese)
Prof. Carmen Chaves Tesser
Dept. of Romance Languages
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Phi Sigma Iota (All Foreign Languages)
Prof. Marie-France Hilgar
Dept. of Foreign Languages
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Pi Delta Phi (French)
Prof. Mary E. Gutermuth
Dept. of Foreign Languages
Box 2147
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77341

Sigma Delta Mu (Spanish in Two-year Colleges)
Prof. Donna M. Wilson
Dept. of Foreign Languages
Highline Community College
Box 9800
Des Moines, WA 98198-9800

Sigma Delta Pi (Spanish)
Prof. Ignacio R. M. Galbis
Box 55125
Riverside, CA 92517

RBK

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Although international students on your campus can be a great asset to your department, at times one must be very firm. Some individuals have the idea that being native speakers of Guaraní makes them perfect teachers of that language. Regrettably, nothing could be further from the truth. Resist hiring a student from Algeria for that extra class of French unless he or she has had training as a **language teacher**. Do, however, attempt to use such students as tutors, language lab assistants, for cultural liaison, and for other similar areas. And make certain that they are paid for their contributions to the campus community. Generally, one should be paid for expertise, although there may be some exceptions.

Developing a small corps of well informed foreign students who can fan out into area secondary schools to make presentations to language clubs can be very helpful to the department, to the secondary school, and to the individual international student. Similarly, various high school summer programs, short-term efforts involving visiting secondary school teachers, and language houses for your majors and other students can all benefit from the language talent and cultural awareness of international students. Avoid, however, giving your administration the impression that anyone who can speak a language is automatically facile in teaching it; such an attitude only detracts from the quality professional environment that you are trying to establish. **RBK**

LANGUAGE/LEARNING LABORATORIES

As chair of a language department, you may have responsibility for laboratory facilities used by your unit. While the lab can be placed in the nuisance category at times, it can also provide a significant opportunity to enhance your equipment, to augment opportunities for your students, and to add to the prestige of your department. Presidents, deans, and other administrators usually like to come to the door of a shiny new facility and say to visitors in hushed tones something like: "this is our language laboratory. Students love it; it solves most of our problems with languages, and don't you really like all that beautiful new equipment?" Even though higher administrators may view a lab in terms different from yours, always take advantage of any favorable point of view expressed by them and turn it to the benefit of your department.

If your institution is big enough, do your best to acquire a permanent director for the lab on a full- or part-time basis. While it is not essential to have the director there every minute the facility is open, he or she should have definite hours of availability. In smaller schools, you should try to assign most of the day-to-day responsibility to a reliable graduate or work study student, some other type of student employee, or (in a medium-sized school) to a faculty colleague who receives a reduced teaching load in exchange for this arrangement.

If you have the good fortune to be able to influence equipment purchases, insist on buying top quality; machines and furniture which receive constant use break down at an alarming rate if you have skimped on cost. Do urge your dean to give you an adequate budget for repairs and supplies. Although it may seem a minor point, it is absolutely **vital** that you insist on an appealing setting with some attractive art work (there **are** labs which have forms of art higher than travel posters on the walls!), well-painted and well-maintained walls, clean seats and carpet, and a good ventilation system. Your director or the student workers will have to keep a bottle of household cleaner/disinfectant at hand. Silly, you say? You will be pleasantly surprised to find what clean, well-maintained, attractive laboratory facilities mean to well-motivated, serious students—and even to a few of the rest. **RBK**

LIABILITY INSURANCE

We live in a litigious society in a litigious era. Although regular faculty are seldom sued, chairpersons in their capacity as administrators are sometimes attached to lawsuits brought against the institution. Because chairpersons are vulnerable, it is wise to consider professional liability insurance. Among the many situations and issues inviting lawsuits are improper placement of students, improper instruction, counseling or testing, all manner of personnel matters including tenure and promotion, sexual harassment, and discrimination.

When shopping for liability insurance, read the fine print. Most policies cover attorney fees and settlements whether the allegations against you are true or false. But most policies also exclude specific charges, including those of a criminal nature, unless you are found "not guilty" or the charges are dismissed. Typically, coverage protects from damages resulting from a negligent act, misstatements or misleading statements, and wrongful acts of other persons for whose actions you are legally responsible. Be certain to check with the agent writing your household insurance; frequently, professional liability is (or can be) attached to an extant policy for an extremely low cost. The central point regarding liability insurance is that you may be sued simply because you are the chairperson. So, seek protection before it happens. **SLS**

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT:
DO YOUR LOYALTIES GO UP OR DOWN?

At some early point as a departmental chair, you have to make a decision about the direction of your chief loyalties. Do they extend upward toward the dean or some other administrative figure or do they extend downward (perhaps **horizontally** on the same level is a better, although less realistic, expression) to your colleagues? No matter which you choose—and this is a choice you cannot avoid making—the character of your work will be significantly affected. It is inevitably your responsibility that you must at times represent the department to the higher administration and that you must at other times represent the administration to the department. I suggest a middle of the road approach to this perplexing problem: **let this matter be decided by a loyalty to your discipline.**

If the dean simply can't understand why departmental personnel are unable to teach five classes per semester (after all, they're mostly **language** classes!), you know why such a plan would effectively destroy professionalism in your department. The dean, who is usually trained in another intellectual discipline and who may or may not be particularly sympathetic to languages, legitimately may **not** know. Loyalty to your discipline enables you to be fully supportive of the discipline itself, the institution, and departmental personnel at the same time. There will be occasions when you seemingly will have to oppose the administration, and others when you will have to go against what a majority of departmental members wants. So be it. After all, the cutting edge of your intellect has been honed on your discipline, not on management principles as such. **RBK**

NETWORKING

In an earlier chapter there is a discussion of professional networking on a regional and national level. This, of course, is extremely important for successful chairs, but networking within your own institution is also very important. A teaching or research professor's network is generally quite limited if not downright paltry. But a chair's network must be broad and secure.

Usually, a chairperson's network will develop naturally over three or four years as he or she finds it necessary to deal with individual agents and offices. But a more intelligent approach is to accelerate this development by purposely cultivating friendships and relationships among the many key players on campus. These would include all other administrators, librarians, university radio and TV personnel, fiduciary offices and staff, student financial aid, the school newspaper, chairs of campus committees, personnel office, physical plant, bookstore, office of research and sponsored programs, public relations office, continuing education, and many others.

Networking works both ways. First and foremost it is a way for you to get things done quickly and right by knowing those who are in charge and how to approach them. Keep a box of "thank you" notes in your desk for those times when someone facilitates a project above and beyond the call of normal duty. Also be sure to keep them on your holiday card list. Simple gestures build large bridges. But networking also assumes that you will be expected to reciprocate. Remember to respond in a forthright and timely fashion when it's your turn to do the deed. Favors done for others in an institutional setting will produce a wealth of "chips" with which to advance your program. **SLS**

NEWSLETTERS

One of the most important items a department can produce is a newsletter. It serves a variety of purposes. Clearly, it is promotional in nature. It publicizes your program with regard to its activities and accomplishments. It also serves as an internal coalescing device in which all the faculty are invited to contribute. It is also informational in nature. If the direct mail lists include high schools and school districts, as they should, it will also act as a recruiting tool. Finally, be sure to send a copy of each issue of the newsletter to every important administrator on campus. Blow your horn loudly. If you are in a state-supported institution, send a copy to all appropriate state-level officials.

Newsletters should be newsy and not just a boring litany of faculty accomplishments. Talk about programs and initiatives. Be sure to include human interest articles. Share information about alumni, and remember to invite contributions from your readership. Good models of depart-mental newsletters are those of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Colorado and the Department of Romance Languages at the University of Tennessee.

When executed properly (there are many downright dull, NAY, insipid newsletters written as if professors were talking to a readership of other professors), a newsletter can be a powerful advertising tool that will reward the department richly. **SLS**

OFFICE APPEARANCE

Although the dictum "It's better to look good than be good" may somewhat overstate the matter in the case of foreign language departments, it is not far off the mark. Attention should be given to presenting a departmental office that is modern, clean, well-lighted, comfortable, and intelligently arranged, with a few choice pieces of art. Likewise, faculty should be encouraged to keep their offices in good condition. Students, parents, campus administrators, and faculty members from other academic units who visit the departmental office often judge your department by the cosmetic veneer they see. Interestingly, your relative position in the pecking order in the institution is occasionally discerned by such superficial but important concerns. This can even have important political implications for your program. **SLS**

PAPER TRAILS SHOULD BE HAPPY TRAILS

The matter of documenting departmental policies and personnel issues is a constant concern for most chairpersons. This fact is particularly true in situations where the chair must be concerned about legal protection. Therefore, it is advisable for all chairpersons to develop strategies for creating helpful "paper trails" to defend and document decisions and positions taken by the chair and others who may be involved in administrative judgments.

It is important to note that while "putting it in writing" is generally a good idea, sometimes it is just as wise to avoid "putting it in writing." Thus, deciding what to do often requires a judgment call. Remember that written documents generated from and for the administrative unit may be subject to court subpoena. Also, decide early on if you want to store such documentation on hard disks, backup disks, or only on hard copy. So, if you are trying to build a case against, let us say, an incompetent, recalcitrant, or insubordinate faculty member, you should carefully communicate via memos, notes, or letters. Also remember that by "copying" (cc or xc) the document to another person or persons you will generally increase the value of the documentation.

Finally, if you decide NOT to set up a paper trail, but you want to keep a record of, for instance, when encounters occurred, the content and nature of discussions, and so forth, you should incorporate such information informally in your "private home diary" that is not the property of the department or the university. Courts have a hard time securing personal, private information stored in your bedroom. **SLS**

PATHWAYS UP AND OUT

Research shows that most chairs of foreign language departments do not go beyond that point in administration. Indeed, they typically return to teaching as opposed to seeking professional advancement. Others, however, find administration much more exciting and intellectually stimulating than anything found either in teaching or research. For such persons, seeking a chair in a bigger department or a deanship becomes a reasonable goal. If being a chair is a stepping stone, then one is well-advised to learn as much about "administration" as possible, including professional development. Obviously, networking at a national level is mandatory.

Some astute observers have contended that being associated with foreign languages is the "kiss of death" when it comes to administrative advancement. The sheer paucity of foreign language professors who have successfully advanced to deanships and beyond is staggering. Whether foreign languages as a discipline are viewed as strange, arcane, esoteric, or alien is not certain, but there may be something about the general perception of languages that tends to limit foreign language chairpersons in their bid for higher office. So, to counter such perceptions and to put our potential candidacy on a par with that of English and history professors, it is absolutely essential to cultivate and project an administrative/managerial *persona*. **SLS**

PLACING YOUR GRADUATES (B.A./M.A. LEVEL)

Problems about placement on the B.A./M.A. level are usually different from those in Ph.D. departments, in part because many of your people will teach in secondary schools if they are not looking for a graduate school. It is absolutely vital to maintain frequent, sincere, and active contact with the secondary teachers of languages in your area, state, or region. And it is vital to do so with a stance and spirit of equality, not superiority. Often, these people will call you when there is a sudden or unexpected vacancy in their schools; you want to ensure that they call **you**, not your counterpart at another college or university. It is a frequent experience that there is simply no one to recommend. In such a case, suggest that the individual call a neighboring chair. While no one should habitually denigrate loyalty to one's own institution, our intellectual commitment must be to our discipline, not to a narrower focus.

When your B.A. (or M.A.) students are looking for a university where they might most profitably complete a terminal degree, consider carefully the **individual**. Some people are simply not called to a traditional program in literature, preferring instead to do work in pedagogy, culture, linguistics, or allied fields. It is essential that you establish and retain a current knowledge of the chief departments of languages, not only in your region, but all over the country. Departmental situations change over the decades, and what was a strong program ten years ago is not necessarily so at present. Two of the best ways of acquiring current knowledge about such matters are to read incessantly in your discipline and to participate actively in national professional organizations. **RBK**

POLICY STATEMENTS CONCERNING LANGUAGES

The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, an auxiliary of the Modern Language Association, occasionally issues statements on various items of policy concerning languages and language departments which may be useful to you in negotiations, arguments, or disputes with higher administrative officials on your campus (you know, the kind of dean who just can't understand why you are unable to handle 50 students in French 101 when your colleagues in History have 300 warm bodies—and 1200 student credit hours—in Western Civ!).

Policies covered by ADFL include reasonable and perspicacious statements on class size, teaching load, flexibility of work loads, standards for selecting a chair, professional development for junior faculty, the evaluation of non-traditional fields (such as Chicano literature, Afro-French studies, women's studies, film scholarship, etc.), and utiliza-tion of part-time faculty. More statements will surely be developed as conditions require. For copies of these statements and for departmental membership in ADFL, write to Dr. Elizabeth Welles, Director of For-eign Language Programs and Director of the Association of Departments of

Foreign Languages, Modern Language Association, 10 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003-6981.

Membership in ADFL should be considered an indispensable part of a department's budget and not something to be sacrificed in an unfavorable budget year. ADFL also sponsors several seminars each summer which are geared to both new and old chairs; these seminars are among the most useful, practical, and cost-effective bits of help you will be able to find as a chair. Those who fail to take advantage of the vast compendium of expertise available at these seminars do so at the cost of learning the hard way about chairing. **RBK**

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CHAIRPERSONS

In numerous places throughout this volume, contributing authors have observed directly and indirectly that the typical graduate school preparation of a Ph.D. in foreign languages has virtually nothing to do with being a manager. Indeed, some argue that choosing administrators or leaders from a pool of Ph.D.s in foreign languages is a bad idea, for they are among the least competent to lead anything. Significantly, successful chairpersons do *not* view themselves as teachers and/or researchers with "additional" duties. On the contrary, they view themselves as administrators who may or may not do some teaching and some research. When asked what they do at the university, they respond: "I am an administrator." In any event, professors of languages who end up as administrators often find their skills lacking in several areas. Thus, they seek professional development opportunities.

Some of the many areas in which new chairpersons seek professional development are faculty and staff evaluation procedures, conflict resolution, managerial skills, counseling and advising techniques, new computer skills, recruitment of students and faculty, assessment of program outcomes, adult education programs, grantsmanship, legal issues, and professional ethics. To become more effective as a chair while continuing to grow professionally, chairpersons should underscore the importance of professional development by involving themselves in such training.

There are many opportunities for professional development. Some of the agencies and institutions that regularly offer significant workshops and seminars for chairpersons include The American Council on

Education, Harvard University, the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, the Association of University Administrators, and many others. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* is a good source for upcoming seminars and workshops relevant to chairs. **SLS**

SCHEDULING

There are of course certain institutional principles which must be observed in scheduling. If your department is a sizeable one, it probably is best to let another professor have this task; if your numbers are smaller, you will probably find it advantageous to do it yourself. Do **not** leave it to the departmental secretary or to anyone else without faculty rank. Scheduling is a case where one may have to take a bit of heat—something which should not be directed toward lower-level personnel.

You will save yourself and others untold grief if you make every attempt to comply with people's preferences, although reasonable individuals understand that occasionally someone will have to teach at an hour which might be considered less than optimal. Send a memo to colleagues several weeks before the schedule is to be made out, asking not for a specific schedule—although this might be justified in certain infrequent cases—but rather for hours or classrooms which the individual really wants to avoid or prefers. It is not necessary to ask for specific reasons why some prefer to exclude certain class hours; health concerns, child care, transportation problems, and similar difficulties are highly personal matters, and your role is not that of confessor. **Never**, under any conditions, use a schedule to punish a teacher for real or imagined sins; such behavior is childish at best, churlish at worst, and totally unworthy of an academician. **RBK**

SOME ADDITIONAL POINTS CONCERNING INTERVIEWS AT MEETINGS AND ON CAMPUS

The Modern Language Association has developed a very helpful sheet of suggestions concerning interviews for both interviewers and candidates. Although some chairs have never considered seriously the thought that they do not know exactly what to do in an interview, it is a fact that many of them, during an interview, are unknowledgeable about the candidate (sometimes because they have failed to read the *CV*), inept, bored, tired, or treading on the frontiers of illegality or poor taste. Copies of this sheet—usually printed on bright yellow paper—are easily available at the MLA's Annual Meetings, particularly at the very early sessions (frequently numbers 1 and 2) concerning job interviews in English and Foreign Languages. While these hints are specifically related to interviews at conventions, common sense will easily alter most of them to fit on-campus situations. Presumably, the MLA would be kindly disposed to sending you a copy. Write to them (or to ADFL) at 10 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003. The MLA not unnaturally thinks more highly of you if you are a member, although sometimes even that doesn't help.

It usually falls to chairs to determine the on-campus schedule for candidates who have been invited to their school. Here are a few suggestions: let common sense reign supreme in these matters and treat candidates as you would want to be treated. Let candidates have breakfast by themselves so they can have at least one relatively relaxing meal and so they can take care of the needs of personal hygiene and comfort before they commence a difficult day. Try to have them see the dean (or the equivalent administrator) early in the day. You should meet with the candidate next, but make certain that you have a final exit interview as the last appointment during the day. I found that this could most easily be accomplished if I took the candidate back to the airport and "conducted" the most informal of interviews in a car; this is, of course, not possible in some situations. You can schedule some "group" interviews with faculty members, although there should be a maximum of three faculty present and the format should be very informal. If you are in a small town, let the candidate see a bit of the local ambience.

Be certain to leave the candidate with at least a half hour of free time in the morning or in the afternoon so he or she can wander a bit through the campus, browse in the bookstore, and—most importantly—get away from the inevitable pressure of an interview. Many candidates, particularly those new to the field, are much more nervous than is merited, and those already employed ideally should feel a humane sense of mentoring such people. While you should be positive about your institution and its diverse aspects, don't be pollyanna-like just to make an impression on the candidate you believe you want. Always remember that a good interview is a two-way street: a candidate should be encouraged to ask questions and to determine the lay of the land. Candidates, after all is said and done, may not want you, even if you want them. **RBK**

TEACHER EDUCATION

For many, if not most, four-year foreign language programs, teacher education plays an important role, because a significant number of language majors and minors continue to come from the pool of students who want to teach. It is incumbent upon the chairperson to cultivate positive relationships with the teacher education program on his/her campus. This process includes an active interest in the recruitment of future foreign language teachers, a shared interest in second language methods courses, future teacher job placement, and student teaching.

It is curious though true that many college and university foreign language programs employ professors who hold in utter disdain not only teacher education programs but, by extension, the whole idea that their own students might want to engage in the nasty business of teaching in the public schools. After all, truly good students go on to graduate school and become clones of their undergraduate professors. But the truth is that many undergraduate students want to teach languages in a high school, and the chairperson is duty bound to treat that choice with dignity and seriousness. That means that the chairperson must understand the components and issues associated with teacher education. **SLS**

TEACHING LOAD

ADFL guidelines state clearly that language professors "should spend no more that 12 hours per week per semester in the classroom. If there is an expectation of an ongoing research agenda, they should be required to teach no more than nine hours per week (three courses)." It is not uncommon to find administrators who feel that language department personnel—since professors in them normally teach one or two classes which are essentially skill-building in nature rather than intellectually-oriented in the traditional sense—can handle loads which far exceed those mandated for fields such as English, history, psychology, chemistry, and mechanical engineering. Strongly resist the attempt to denigrate or diminish the standing of languages in any way. Language professionals, of course, have the concomitant obligation to produce worthy scholarship so as to dispel erroneous notions about the intellectual base of language degrees.

Move toward some flexibility of work loads; if a professor is making a final push to finish a book in a spring semester, a reduced teaching load will usually be a big help. Simply do not permit overly-enthusiastic individuals to teach extra classes to get a less commonly taught language going, to rescue an area of an already taught language which is in danger of sinking, or to avoid research obligations and opportunities. Higher administrators have the tendency to think that because Professor A can teach four or five classes for a semester, Professors B, C, and D can manage the same load with no trouble, ignoring the fact that the latter individuals may be busily engaged in research or service while the former does little outside of the classroom. Occasionally, someone will "beat the system" by fulfilling little beyond teaching responsibilities. This is one of the prices we pay for democracy; sometimes individuals do not carry their fair share of the load, although most do so very willingly. **RBK**

TEN POINTS TO KEEP IN MIND WHEN YOU INTERVIEW FOR A LANGUAGE CHAIR'S POST ON A NEW CAMPUS

There is a considerable difference between accepting a chair's post on a campus where you are already a professor and one with which you have no previous connection. If you have been on a campus for at least several years, and even if you know the institution very well, as a potential chair you need to have a long and completely frank talk with the dean. If you receive the impression that you are essentially wasting his or her time, it is a good indication that the central administration is not particularly interested in the department; you might as well let someone else be selected for what is certain to be an unhappy or boring experience consisting largely of non-creative paperpushing and routine supervision.

If you are new to a campus when you interview for a chair's post, you should keep in mind at least the following ten points:

1) What does the dean **really** think of the department? Ask for an in-depth picture of his or her feelings and also for his or her perception of how **others** on campus view the department. **Don't be afraid to press hard for details, or to probe deeply.**

2) What are the dean's (and other administrators') plans for the unit? Do they view it as a service department whose principal function is to teach elementary and intermediate language courses? Do they think the group has a valid and growing intellectual role on campus? In what direction has the department been moving relative to these concerns for the last decade? What is the intellectual trajectory of the group?

3) What are the projected retirements in the department within the next five years? If you most likely won't be able to hire anyone for several years, it will be harder to accomplish your goals, whatever they are.

4) If there is an interim chair, is he or she a candidate for the post? If so, do others in the department view him or her as a viable candidate? Is this person someone who is likely to harbor ill will if someone else receives the appointment?

5) What are likely rewards for those in the department who are active professionally? What is the recent history of the travel budget, and what is the likely availability of more (or even **adequate**) funds for other areas (library materials, computers, laboratory paraphernalia, modern office equipment, and supplies)?

6) Have the dean and departmental personnel really studied in-depth what they most need in a new chair? A classroom teacher who can push paper? A peacemaker? A handholder? An image-builder? Someone from a neutral language who can be viewed without suspicion? Remember that no one individual possesses all the qualities which might be viewed as desirable.

7) What is the situation regarding part-time personnel in the department? To what extent has the institution avoided hiring needed full-time people in order to save money? How many FTE positions are not being filled because they can be staffed more cheaply by part-timers? Has the number of part-time teachers increased or decreased during the last decade, particularly in relation to campus enrollment? How much flexibility does the chair have relative to teaching loads and class size?

8) If you have no other access to this information, you need to make certain the dean tells you the number of professors at various ranks, the gender distribution of the faculty, the distribution of faculty among the various languages, the number of majors and

minors, student enrollment percentages in all languages taught, and the number of support staff. Sometimes this information will be forthcoming quickly, but other times it will be hard-won, as in the case of a department that doesn't wish to publicize that it has only one or two women professors or that enrollment in one of the chief languages is embarrassingly low. **If there is any strong hesitation about giving you this information, you should seriously ask yourself if you really want to be associated with such an institution.**

9) How does the language department relate to other departments, especially (but not exclusively) in the humanities? Are there cooperative programs? Are such programs supported financially by the dean, or are they taken out of departmental resources? Do professors seem to want to get out of their language cocoon and extend their influence by cooperative endeavor? Try to speak with the chair of the English Department and the chair of at least one other humanities department. You will sometimes be surprised by what you learn.

10) It should also be added that it is infinitely easier to secure satisfactory salary, rank, and tenure arrangements before you accept a position rather than relying on chance or the good will of your colleagues to get them for you in the future. **RBK**

TREATMENT OF YOUR PREDECESSOR

Only an ungracious boor uses a new administrative post to "get back at" another administrator for supposed or real grievances from the past. A sense of generosity is unfailingly a hallmark of a forward-looking, cogent, and humane supervisor. Treat your predecessor with unselfishness, kindness, and understanding. Just as he or she was not perfect, neither will you even approach perfection. While it may seem juvenile, the Golden Rule remains a highly desirable guide in such matters. Is it not in **your interest**, in **your predecessor's interest**, and in the **institutional interest** that you have a cooperative friend as your predecessor? After a year or two in your post, you may become a bit more understanding.

If there are matters which you feel you must address, ostensibly to the detriment of your predecessor, **make absolutely certain that these**

matters have a base in professional issues, not in petty personal grievances which have little or nothing to do with your department or discipline. You could, for instance, be tempted to be niggardly with your first salary recommendation for your predecessor; after all, he or she is probably making a pretty good sum and you might like to spread it around to some of your friends. Start with the assumption that the person has legitimately **earned** the salary and be very careful before you use his or her potential raise to reward others who might, for instance, have been more favorable to your own candidacy for the departmental chair. Always let fairness, generosity, and your best human instincts rule the day. A warm, open relationship with your predecessor will go a long way toward establishing the kind of ambience you want and need for your work. **RBK**

WHO'S IN CHARGE WHEN YOU ARE OUT OF TOWN?

Active and successful chairs have to travel often for a variety of reasons and therefore are frequently out of town. In larger departments the chairperson should develop strategies to maintain continuity and the exercise of authority, at least budgetary authority, while he/she is gone on assignment. If there is no Vice Chair, continuity may be achieved by a variety of ways, including the establishment of a rotation list of trusted senior professors, each of whom takes a turn for short periods of time as acting chair. In other settings it may be wise to leave all power in the hands of the secretary. In yet other settings, the Chair may be wise in simply placing the department in momentary receivership by asking the deans's office to act on his/her behalf.

Regardless of the strategy adopted, what is important is that a temporary backup system be in place in the event that the chair, whether for professional or personal reasons, is not able to fulfill normally expected duties. **SLS**

UNIVERSITY LEGAL COUNSEL

All institutions of higher education have a legal counsel (attorney). In larger schools the office will be on campus. In smaller schools it may be a local attorney who provides legal advice on an as-needed basis. In either event, chairpersons should feel free to seek advice from the institution's legal counsel on any matter related to the department that might invite litigation. It is in the chairperson's interest to meet and get to know the legal counsel. **SLS**

WORKING ACRONYMS: 100 GEMS DESIGNED TO BRING JOY TO YOUR PROFESSIONAL LIFE

The foreign language profession is awash in acronyms. At a minimum, all chairs of foreign language departments should be conversant with the following:

AA/EOE	Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer
AAAL	American Association for Applied Linguistics
AATA	American Association of Teachers of Arabic
AATF	American Association of Teachers of French
AATG	American Association of Teachers of German
AATI	American Association of Teachers of Italian
AATSEEL	American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages
AATSP	American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
AAUA	American Association of University Administrators
AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ACE	American Council on Education
ACLA	American Comparative Literature Association
ACLS	American Council of Learned Societies
ACT	American College Test
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ACTR	American Council of Teachers of Russian
ADE	Association of Departments of English
ADFL	Association of Departments of Foreign Languages
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
ALM	Audio-Lingual Method
ALTA	American Literary Translators Association
AP	Advanced Placement
APA	American Philological Association
ATA	American Translators Association

BBE	Bilingual/Bicultural Education
CAI	Computer-Assisted Instruction
CALICO	Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium
CALL	Computer-Assisted Language Learning
CEC	Citizens Exchange Council
CELJ	Council of Editors of Learned Journals
CIEE	Council on International Educational Exchange
CIES	Council for International Exchange of Scholars
CLEP	College Level Examination Program
CLTA	Chinese Language Teachers Association
CPB	Corporation for Public Broadcasting
CSC	Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
DAI	Dissertation Abstracts International
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DOE	Department of Education
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ERIC	Educational Resources Information Center
ESL	English as a Second Language
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ETS	Educational Testing Service
FIPSE	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
FLAC	Foreign Languages Across the Curriculum
FLES	Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools
FLEX	Foreign Language Exploratory Program
FLOP	Foreign Languages for Older People
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FTE	Full-Time Equivalency
GRE	Graduate Record Examination
IALL	International Association for Learning Laboratories
IIE	Institute of International Education

IPA	International Phonetic Alphabet
IREX	International Research and Exchanges Board
JNCL/NCLIS	Joint National Committee for Languages/National Council for Languages and International Studies
L1, L2	First Language, Second Language
LASA	Latin American Studies Association
LCT	Less Commonly Taught Language
LEA	Local Education Agency
LEP	Limited English Proficient
MAT	Miller Analogies Test or Master of Arts in Teaching
MLA	Modern Language Association
MMLA	Midwest Modern Language Association
NA	Natural Approach
NABE	National Association for Bilingual Education
NAIS	National Association of Independent Schools
NCATE	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
NDEA	National Defense Education Act
NEA	National Endowment for the Arts
NEC	Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
NEH	National Endowment for the Humanities
NEMLA	Northeast Modern Language Association
NFMLTA	National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations
NSA	National Security Agency
NTE	National Teachers Examination
OPI	Oral Proficiency Interview
PAPC	Philological Association of the Pacific Coast
PBS	Public Broadcasting System
PI	Principal Investigator
PICS	The Project for International Communication Studies
PNCFL	Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages

RFP	Request for Proposal
RMMLA	Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association
SAMLA	South Atlantic Modern Language Association
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test
SCH	Student Credit Hours
SCMLA	South Central Modern Language Association
SCOLA	Satellite Communications for Learning Worldwide
SCOLT	Southern Conference on Language Teaching
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SWCOLT	Southwest Conference on Language Teaching
TDIE	The Dean is the Enemy
TESOL	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
TPR	Total Physical Response
USIA	United States Information Agency
USIS	United States Information Service

SLS and RBK

A FINAL NOTE:
CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE LANGUAGE CHAIR

Few of these characteristics are applicable solely to a language chair. Indeed, many of them are germane to leading any academic department. Most, in fact, will apply nicely to maintaining authentic membership in the human race. These qualities are listed in random order except for the first. If a chair or potential chair does not have a generous spirit, outlook, and philosophy, he or she should never contemplate the creative management of a language department.

Generosity
Fairness and equanimity
Professional competence
Appreciation of all languages, cultures, and people
Thick skin
Liberality and openness

Wide sphere of interests
Commitment to the totally and liberally educated person
Interest in all levels of education
Commitment to democratic processes and ideas
Commitment to teaching, scholarship, and service
Openness to all academic areas in the institution
Active participation in local, state, regional, and national associations
Ability to encourage and foment progress
Faith in the improvement of the human condition
Ability to dream and be imaginative
Good communicative skills
Honesty and integrity
Realistic enthusiasm
Non-confrontational, non-threatening style
Entrepreneurial spirit
Ability to serve as faculty advocate
Judicious delegation of authority and tasks
Diplomacy for all seasons
Respect for faculty input
Fiduciary acumen
Superb listening ability
Sense of humor

RBK and SLS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

GEORGE ALLAN is Professor of Philosophy and Dean of the College at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

SPURGEON W. BALDWIN is Professor of Spanish and Chair of the Department of Romance Languages and Classics at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

HERMAN F. BOSTICK is Professor of French and former Chair of the Department of Romance Languages at Howard University, Washington, DC. He has served on the ADFL Executive Committee.

BARBARA CROCKETT DEASE is Assistant Dean for Freshman and Sophomore Studies at Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia, and former Chair of the Department of Modern Foreign Languages at Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi.

J. CHRISTOPHER EUSTIS is Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, and Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

ANNE O. FOUNTAIN is Professor of Spanish and former Chair of the Program in Spanish at Peace College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

CLIFFORD J. GALLANT is Professor Emeritus and former Chair of the Department of Romance Languages at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, and an Instructor of Spanish and French at Scottsdale Community College, Scottsdale, Arizona.

RAYMOND GAY-CROSIER is Professor of French and Chair of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

CAROL EBERSOL KLEIN is Assistant Professor of French and Spanish, and Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages at Beaver College, Glenside, Pennsylvania.

RICHARD B. KLEIN is Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, and former Chair of the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi. He is a former Executive Director and a former President of the AATSP, and has served on the ADFL Executive Committee.

NORMAND J. LAMOUREUX is Professor of French and former Chair of the Department of Modern Languages at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts.

FRANK W. MEDLEY, JR., is Associate Professor of Spanish and former Chair of the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

EDWARD J. MULLEN is Professor of Spanish and former Chair of the Department of Romance Languages at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. He has served on the ADFL Executive Committee.

JAMES A. PARR is Professor of Spanish at the University of California, Riverside, and former Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.

CATHERINE R. PERRICONE is Professor of Spanish and Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania.

DANIEL R. REEDY is Professor of Spanish, Dean of the Graduate School, and former Chair of the Department of Spanish and Italian at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

MURRAY SACHS is Professor of French and Comparative Literature, and former Chair of the Department of Romance and Comparative Literature at Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts. He has served on the ADFL Executive Committee.

RUTH A. SCHMIDT is President of Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, and formerly taught Spanish at the State University of New York, Albany, New York.

IVAN A. SCHULMAN is Professor of Spanish and Comparative Literature, and Richard G. and Carole J. Cline University Scholar at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois. He has served as Chair and Director at several institutions, and has just completed a seven-year term as Head of the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese.

SAM L. SLICK is Professor of Spanish and Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

CONSTANCE A. SULLIVAN is Associate Professor of Spanish, former Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and former Chair of the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

CHARLES M. TATUM is Professor of Spanish and Head of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

ROBERT M. TERRY is Professor of French and Chair of the Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures at the University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia. He is the 1994 President of ACTFL.

RICHARD W. THAMES is Professor of German and former Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Montevallo, Montevallo, Alabama.

RAY A. VERZASCONI is Professor of Spanish and Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

NELSON H. VIEIRA is Professor of Portuguese and Brazilian Literature, and former Chair of the Department of Portuguese and Brazilian Studies at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

MARIE ADELE WELLINGTON is a retired Professor of Spanish and Italian, and former Chair of the Department of Spanish and Italian at Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois. She continues to produce scholarship on Hispanic topics. She presently resides in Fredericksburg, Virginia.

PHYLLIS ZATLIN is Professor of Spanish and former Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey (New Brunswick). For six years she served as Associate Dean for Affirmative Action in Rutgers College.

JUAN C. ZAMORA is Professor of Spanish and Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.

RICHARD A. ZIPSER is Professor of German and Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at the University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware. He is a former President of the ADFL Executive Committee.

Ruth A. Schmidt
George Allan
Daniel R. Reedy
Murray Sachs
Ivan A. Schulman
Edward J. Mullen
J. Christopher Eustis
James A. Parr
Herman F. Bostick
Ray A. Verzasconi
Robert M. Terry
Spurgeon W. Baldwin
Charles M. Tatum
Carol Ebersol Klein
Raymond Gay-Crosier
Phyllis Zatlin
Constance A. Sullivan
Normand J. Lamoureux
Frank W. Medley, Jr.
Nelson H. Vieira
Richard A. Zipser
Catherine R. Perricone
Juan C. Zamora
Marie Adele Wellington
Barbara Crockett Dease
Clifford J. Gallant
Sam L. Slick
Richard W. Thames
Anne O. Fountain
Richard B. Klein

The chairperson has been forced to become a sort of Super-Professor who not only continues to teach and do research, but who simultaneously balances budgets and schedules, does staff development, serves as instructional leader, curriculum innovator, counselor, handholder for the seemingly unloved, and much more.

To those many, then, who are serving or who will serve in this super capacity, we commend the sage advice contained herein. May it help you in some small way, at least, not to have to invent one more wheel. May it at a minimum help clarify your administrative views on some of the basic and most palpable issues in our profession.

Sam L. Slick and Richard B. Klein

SCOLT

ISBN 1-883640-00-8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE